

Donald J. Boisvert

**SUMMER '73**



**Student  
AS  
Decision-  
MAKER**

• • •

**Explorations  
into  
Education**

• • •

**A Report  
prepared by  
the Loyola  
Students  
Association**



October 31, 1973.

LOYOLA  
OF MONTREAL  
STUDENTS'  
ASSOCIATION  
ASSOCIATION  
DES ETUDIANTS  
DE LOYOLA  
DE MONTREAL  
INCORPORATED  
1966  
(514) 482-9280  
6931 SHERBROOKE  
STREET WEST,  
MONTREAL 262,  
CANADA

On behalf of the Loyola Students' Association, and more particularly the students enrolled in Explorations into Education, I would like to thank the Loyola College Administration for its support of Student As Decision-Maker, Explorations into Education, and this summer research project on student-oriented educational programmes at Loyola.

On my own behalf, I would like to thank Don Boisvert, Gerry Bushe and Don Stephenson of the ISA for their help in formulating Explorations into Education, and drafting this report.

To the reader, I wish to express my thanks for the interest you are taking in these Education Department programmes. The critical lector will surely note several shortcomings in the draft of this report. As it is my first undertaking of this nature, your comments will be appreciated and will be of service to me in undertaking future projects.

Finally, if this report has not fully communicated to you the essence of my research this past summer, please get in touch with me through the Education Department of the ISA. I will then arrange to meet with you in an effort to convey a fuller understanding of student-oriented educational programmes at Loyola.

Respectfully submitted,

*Charles Moncel*

Charles Moncel,  
Education Department,  
Loyola Students' Association.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
INTRODUCTION	
I    STDM - CO-ORDINATORS FINAL REPORT	1
STDM - APPENDIX TO THE FINAL REPORT	12
APPENDIX I: STUDENT EXPECTATIONS OF STDM	13
APPENDIX II: STUDENT SELF-EVALUATIONS	21
APPENDIX III: STUDENT IMPRESSIONS OF STDM	30
APPENDIX IV: COURSE IMPROVEMENT SURVEY	45
II THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW COURSE	
1. A NEW NAME FOR A NEW COURSE	73
2. EXPLORATIONS INTO EDUCATION: THE STEPHENSON PROPOSAL	74
3. EXPLORATIONS INTO EDUCATION: IN ITS DEFINITIVE FORM	76
4. EXPLORATIONS INTO EDUCATION: NOW AND IN THE FUTURE	82
III THE FUTURE OF STUDENT-ORIENTED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMES	86
SUMMARY	91
RECOMMENDATIONS	91
APPENDIX	

---

## INTRODUCTION

This report is intended to chronicle the history and development of past, present and future student-oriented educational programmes at Loyola.

From the beginning, in the spring and summer of 1972, when former ISA President Gordon Clarke conceived and researched Student-As- Decision-Maker, the concern of the Loyola Students' Association has been to create a programme that would get students more deeply involved in the affairs of their educational community.

Alain Godbout coordinated Student-As-Decision-Maker, and his Final Coordinator's Report is as comprehensive and honest an analysis as can be made on STDM. His report forms the first part of our analysis on student-orientated educational programmes.

The better part of my summer was spent in developing Explorations into Education. Not having participated directly in STDM, I tried as best I could to put together an image of what STDM had been like. I spoke to Alain, met with some students and coordinators, read the reports and studied the recommendations. Out of this reflection came the general idea of what a new course should be like.

Don Stephenson proposed an entirely new structure, format and content for a replacement of STDM. Unfortunately, we could not carry out his proposals for reasons cited in the report. Nonetheless, many of his ideas were later integrated into the Explorations into Education programme.

Explorations into Education, in its definitive form, presents, we hope, the best elements of STDM. Although resigtration for CIE fell below our expectations, I am satisfied in the way in which the course has progressed

so far, and am optimistic with the future of this programme at a university level.

The final part of the report deals with the future. Explorations into Education is too demanding a course to be of popular interest to students. Yet there is a need for large scale involvement and education of students in the affairs of their Campus Community. To attract a large number of students, it seemed best to create a programme similar to that which Don Stephenson had proposed for Explorations. For the sake of convenience, I have tentatively named the programme "University Media", until a more appropriate label is found.

Setting this future programme, recognized as a University level course, is the challenge which lies ahead of us in the months to come.

---



LOYOLA  
OF MONTREAL  
STUDENTS'  
ASSOCIATION  
ASSOCIATION  
DES ETUDIANTS  
DE LOYOLA  
DE MONTREAL  
INCORPORATED  
1966  
(514) 482-9280  
6931 SHERBROOKE  
STREET WEST,  
MONTREAL 262,  
CANADA

21 May 1973

I

STDM

Co-ordinators Final Report

"Student As Decision-Maker" was a CEGEP course, organized and administered by the Loyola of Montreal Students' Association which attempted to be a totally "student-oriented" venture. This means that course content was chosen for its relevance to the Loyola CEGEP student; content was organized so as to give maximum range of student choice; once the course began no major decisions were made without discussion with the students; there was a minimum of lectures, no exams, and a maximum of discussions; the course coordinators were fellow students and young faculty; and the students themselves were responsible for their workload and evaluation. A more detailed account of the course's development appears in "STDM - First Term Report" (available upon request).

Evaluation, for STDM, has meant an assessment of the collective effort rather than marking of individual effort. This was so partly because our attention was mainly on the progress of the course as a whole and partly out of a general disdain for grading.

This report is meant to present the results of a process of course evaluation of STDM undertaken by all those directly involved in the course.

The final two weeks of the course were spent in assessing the year's experiment. Firstly, the students were asked to write what the course meant to them at this point and this was matched up with their written expectations of the course done in September and again in December. Secondly, the students were asked to assign themselves a grade (administrative requirement) and to justify it. Thirdly, they were asked to write their general impressions of the course. Fourthly, the students composed a set of questions meant to bring out the problems encountered by them in STDm, and to point towards possible improvements. The coordinators compiled these questions into a survey and the students replied to the questions. Participation in the different stages of this process varied about 18 out of 23 students.

What follows are résumés of the student feedback. The original responses have been appendixed separately and are available upon request.

Expectations: (see Appendix I)

In September, the stated course expectations reflected the information offered in the course brochure. People stated they expected to learn about one or more of the topics listed as modules and a few indicated that they expected to learn about "Decision-Making".

In December, people are talking about EDUCATION in general terms and about developing self-discipline. There is a positive overtone.

At the end of the year, a sense of unfulfilled expectations is expressed but coupled with commitment to the ideals of the course and to its immediate future (next year).

Self-Evaluation: (see Appendix II)

Thirteen out of the eighteen students who replied attempted to rationalize their grade seriously and five decided not to try. Of the thirteen, four related their performance in this course to that in their other courses, one related his performance to that of the other students, three referred to achievement of goals, and five referred to their effort. It seems to me that if self-evaluation is to be used again one might consider designing a self-evaluation questionnaire using these four criteria.

Impressions of STD: (see Appendix III)

Of the eighteen students who replied, three had unqualified praise for the course, four were mostly critical, and ten found the course interesting/worthwhile but had complaints and suggestions, and one did not make himself clear.

Those who were unqualifyingly positive spoke of interesting material, freedom of choice, enhanced awareness of identity as student and thinker, and a new type of learning. Those who were mostly negative spoke of poor organization, low standards, vague course goals, and one-sided criticism of traditional education. Those with recommendations spoke of screening students before enrollment, lengthening modules or even dropping the system, more structure, especially at the outset, and clarification of goals.

This is at best a mosaic of my understanding of the student impressions. It would be best if you read their actual replies. (Appendix III)

Course Improvement Survey: (see Appendix IV)

The following are the summarized responses to the questionnaire. An asterisk before the question indicates that because of either the importance of the topic or the difficulty in summarizing, the appendix should be consulted.

### Course Improvement Survey

What did you think of the name of the course "Student as Decision-Maker"?

- 11 students found it inappropriate
- 6 found it irrelevant
- 1 not sure

Should it be changed?

- 8 yes
- 6 no
- no comment

If so, what is your suggestion?

- Those that said it should be changed all mentioned Education in the name.

What do you think of the way in which the course was presented to you in September?

- 13 found it vague
- 3 said it was well-presented
- 2 no answer

Did it seem to have a clear goal?

- 14 no
- 3 yes
- not sure

If so what was that goal?

- 3 mentioned the role of student in education. 1 also said they got lost in their surroundings.

Was that goal achieved?

- 4 no
- 3 yes
- 11 don't know

Do you think you were ready for a course like this?

- 9 no
- 7 yes
- 3 not sure

What should be the goal of next year's course?

- 5 students said it should be more structured.
- 4 no answer
- 1 don't know
- The others responded that a closer look at education was needed, working collectively, while each student worked on an individual project.

How would you compare this course with your other courses?

- 3 said it fit in with their other courses
- 1 no difference
- The rest found it very different and beneficial.

How well do you feel this course was administered?

- 4 replied it was not well administered
- 4 no answer
- The remaining students considered the fact the course new and thought the co-ordinators made a good attempt.

Were you satisfied with the module co-ordinators? (Comments on the individual co-ordinators are welcome)

- In general, 13 were satisfied
- And 5 were not
- Those who mentioned individual co-ordinators were satisfied with Alain, Don B., Don M., Jenny, and Modules 2, 5, & 8.
- Unsatisfied with Val and Pierre and Modules 1 & 6.

How do you think the module co-ordinators handled the problems of STDM?

- 8 students were not satisfied with the way that co-ordinators handled the problems.
- 3 did not answer
- 7 were satisfied.

What do you think of students acting as co-ordinators?

- 14 were very satisfied
- 2 were not happy at all
- 1 made no difference
- 1 no answer

Do you think there are some STDM students who would make good co-ordinators for next year?

- 13 responded yes
- 3 no
- 2 no answer.

\*

What did you think of the actual content of the modules? (Comments on individual modules are welcome).

- In general 8 students did not like the content
- 8 students replied they liked the content
- 1 no answer
- 1 first term he liked, second term he did not like.
- Specific modules that they were satisfied with are:  
Don B., Don M., Alain, Graham, Jenny, #'s 2, 4, 5, 8 and Alternate Structures of Education
- Unsatisfied with - Don's, Module 6, Module on High Schools.

Are there any Modules that should be scrapped? (Specify)

- 7 yes
- 2 no
- 3 don't know
- 5 no answer
- 1 student said they should be "amalgamated"
- The ones mentioned most often that should be scrapped are:  
High School, How Loyola Functions.

Can you think of new topics? (Specify)

- 9 no answer
- 3 no
- The remaining 6 were vague in their topics, but only one of them mentioned less on education. The other 5 mentioned new looks at education, i.e. student organizing, marking system.

Were the topics specific enough? Were the discussions realistic?

<u>Topics</u>	<u>Discussions</u>
- 11 yes	- 6 yes
- 7 no	- 8 no
	- 3 do not know
	- 1 no answer

Would you like to have had MORE or LESS of these methods of teaching/learning?

Lectures: 6 more, 7 less, 4 no comment, 1 same

Guest speakers: 16 more, 2 no comment.

Written Assignments: 5 more, 6 less, 5 no comment, 2 depends on the individual.

Reading Assignments: 10 more, 3 less, 3 no comment, 1 same, 1 depends on the individual.

Individual Projects: 8 more, 3 less, 3 no comment, 3 depends on the individual, 1 not sure.

Group Projects: 11 more, 3 less, 3 no comment, 1 depends on the individual.

Student Presentations: 11 more, 2 less, 4 no comment, 1 same.

Exams: 9 no, 4 less, 4 no comment, 1 same.

Discussions: 9 more, 5 less, 3 no comment, 1 same.

Individual Tutors: 6 more, 6 less, 6 no comment.

Films: 15 more, 3 no comment.

Assigned Texts: 4 more, 10 less, 3 no comment, 1 depends on the individual.

Are there any other methods you would recommend? (Specify)

- no comment 10
- no 2
- of the remaining six who did comment, 4 mentioned getting out of the classroom.

\* What did you think of the module system?

- 15 students did not like it for 15 different reasons
- 3 students liked the module system.

Should there be fewer or more? Should they be smaller or larger?

Fewer - 13	Smaller - 9
More - 1	N.A. - 4
Don't know	

Should there be "off periods" between modules? Should there be different co-ordinators for each module?

"off periods"                      different co-ordinators

Yes - 9                              Yes - 12

No - 6                                No - 3

No Answer - 3                      No Answer - 3

Further Comments:

- 8 no reply

Of the remaining six replies, most specified that each co-ordinator should specialize in a module.

Did you prefer to meet in A315, LSA Building, co-ordinator's home/office or other? (Specify)

- 6 no answer

- LSA building 2

- 4 Office/home

- 3 A315

What did you think of self-evaluation?

- All thought it was a good idea and most judged it to be the best way to evaluate themselves.

Would you like to be evaluated by your fellow students?

- 5 - yes

10 - no

3 - no answer

Would you like to be evaluated by your module co-ordinator?

- 4- yes

- 9- no

- 5- no answer

Would you like to be evaluated by another person? (Specify)

- 5 - no answer

- 6 - yes - either by fellow students collectively or alone, or by co-ordinator and possibly orally.

- 6 - no: most did not specify.

Should STDM have been a half-credit?      Would you have taken it as such?

- 4 yes

-13 no

6 - yes

8 - no

3 not sure

Should it have been a non-credit?

- 1 yes

-13 no

- 3 no answer

Would you have taken it as such?

1 - yes

14 - no

2 - not sure

\* Should the co-ordinators have exercised more control over the course? (Explain)

- 6 yes because of the novelty of the course

- 9 no because it would defeat the purpose of the course.

- \* Who should decide about module topics, assignments, and student evaluation? Explain.

The majority said it should be students and co-ordinators.

What did you think of the student co-ordinating council?

- 6 students felt that the council was a good idea.
- 9 students did not like it.
- 3 no answer.

- \* What should the role of the student be in this kind of a course?

- 4 no answer

The remaining 14 felt that the student should be active, interested, and work collectively for the benefit of the individual.

How should the acceptance of students into the course operate?

- 9 suggest screening, interviews, or some other selective method.
- 7 suggest regular enrollment (students' interest)

- \* If you were interviewing students interested in taking STDm, what qualities would you look for?

Most felt that the students should be interested, mature, responsible, and people-oriented.

If you had known what you know now of STDm, would you still have enrolled in this course last September? If you had the opportunity to enrol in the new modified course next year, would you?

"September"

- 14 - yes
- 3 - no
- 1 - not sure

"new course"

- 14 - yes
- 4 - not sure

- \* Further Comments

Those who answered did like the course but felt the course needed some modifications, revisions for next year.

What do you think of this questionnaire?

Most found it adequate or pretty good. 2 students found it too long.

What do you think of our whole process for evaluating STDm?

(Your impressions, what were your objectives, discussion questionnaire)

- 6 no answer

The remaining 12 felt that evaluation was an important thing, and of a good use.

### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From both the feedback of the students and my own experience with the course I can say that STDm was a worthwhile and meaningful experiment.

Its value for the students was an opportunity (in many cases fully employed) to become more aware of their identity and condition as students, to explore the complications of freedom within an institution, to begin to grasp where lies the responsibility for their own education, and to begin to explore a fair number of issues in higher education. Its value for me as a student organizer/administrator was in "finding out where the walls are" in college education as regards both the institution and students themselves.

The problems for STDm were: confused objectives and a misleading name, shaky funding at the outset, an ill-conceived and ineffectively-operated modular work-unit system, the confused notion that a gang of students just out of high school can collectively make all the decisions required for running a college course, and the severe shortage of time of the co-ordinators.

It appears that there are the necessary conditions for a second year to this student-initiated venture: some of the past year's students are interested, the L.S.A. is interested, and the College administration is interested.

...../10.

These are my recommendations:

The stress for next year should be on researching and implementing the students' suggestions (i.e. that the course idea is basically good, applicants should be screened, work units should be longer or unspecific, small groups, stronger direction from the co-ordinators at the outset, and better preparation of the subject matter).

The co-ordinator of the course should devote all of his L.S.A. time to the project (i.e. no other student association responsibilities - this is not a part-time matter). It is his job to ensure that the students who enroll (and it need not be a large number) have all the resources (budget, operating space, on- and off-campus research sources, contacts with the best-suited faculty) that they need.

As the coming year is the last for Loyola's CEGEP a flawless proposal for a student-initiated course on the University level should be in the planning for submission to the Curriculum people in January, 1974.

At this point, there need be no great concern with the course being "student-oriented" rather than "traditional". Nor should any other tangents be embarked upon. Rather the effort should be to create a rich milieu for those students who want to explore some facet of education without the regular hassles of established departments, course requirements, etc. The *raison d'être* of the student-initiated course is that no regular course offers

such unrestricted opportunity to explore the issues in education which interest the more critical student.

The student-directed course is simple in theory but unpredictable and strange in practice. It will be interesting to see what next year's experimenters will create.

Respectfully,

Alain Godbout

May 21, 1973.

STDM

APPENDIX TO THE FINAL REPORT

---

- I. Expectations
- II. Self-Evaluation
- III. Impressions of STDM
- IV. Course Improvement Survey

APPENDIX I

Student Expectations of STDM

The very first task encountered by the students in September was to write what they were expecting of the course (1). The question was repeated in December (2). Near the end of the course, the students were asked what the course meant to them at that point (3).

The three responses have been matched and are presented below.

1. Mark Twain: "Don't let your schooling interfere with your education".
2. This course, to me, sounds pretty good. I expect to learn about students, and people in general.
3. At this point, I can very honestly say that the course was not even close to my expectations. The only two things I am getting from this course are:
  - 1) an interesting few weeks getting feedback from Dawson;
  - 2) a credit.

- - - - -

1. Insight into the administration of schools; why students don't play a larger role in their education; how teachers and students can work together to achieve mutual goals;
2. Unanswered.
3. Right now I feel that STDM should be preparing itself for next year. I would like to be able to participate in the shaping of STDM next year, and possibly acting as a coordinator. The course is now over, and I believe that after a review, work on next year's session of STDM should be started as soon as possible.

- - - - -

1. Nil
2. Nil
3. I'm still attending classes because I never know what the next lecture is going to be like. I come, I sit, I see and listen; if it's bullshit to me, I leave. If I enjoy the material discussed, I stay. I have no concrete objectives or goals to achieve except for my credit. I just like to find out things and if I get interested, I get involved. Out of all the modules, if I only find one or two interesting, I'm satisfied.

1. Nil
2. A greater knowledge of what I'm into: Education.
3. I came today mainly to hand in a mark for myself; also though, because I'm still interested in the course for what reasons, I honestly don't know.

- - - - -

1. Nil
2. Want:
  - 1) freedom as a goal in itself;
  - 2) learning (formal) as secondary to the development of freedom enhancing attitudes;
  - 3) learning to be seen as a continuous informal process - i.e., not related to grades, courses, universities, etc.
  - 4) to see limits as obstacles to be transcended. That is, those limits which are imposed by outside, illegitimate forces, through coercion - not as sacred rituals to be preserved above all else.

Expect: conservative development of traditional learning (i.e. grades, lectures, impersonal role-acting) with a tint of "freedom" (i.e. token participation on low-level decision-making) within the given limitations (i.e. course, grades, format).
3. Goal to get a half-decent mark for next year. Really not much else. Head just isn't with the course. It doesn't mean very much of anything to me. Hope it goes on next year for other students, because it is better than many other more frustrating courses. But just doesn't work out with my plans.

- - - - -

1. To help you face situations while trying to be non-committed to any side of the affair and getting a just view of the facts;
2. The capability of organizing my own private studies and research

with the minimum of direction from any kind of authority;

3. I should want to take some experiences in a different form of education. So far, nothing has happened, but some day things will get moving. There has to be something better than CEGEPS right now! The form has to be organized and have precise goals, etc....

- - - - -

1. an insight into what makes Loyola College what it is;
2. a better understanding of education;
3. to get an understanding of what education is, and how it works.  
An interest to ensure a revised STDM will be presented for next year.

- - - - -

1. Nil
2. Nil
3. The reason why I still come to STDM class is probably because I know that the course is still not finished, and I still feel as if I should come, even though I've already marked myself.  
Also, I come in order to see how the coordinators and students are reflecting on the past year, and to see what changes will occur for next year.

- - - - -

1. Nil
2. I would like to get a greater knowledge of what education is.
3. One reason for coming to class is the experience. Learning is the

experience of knowing people. In this class, I have learned that a lot of people are irresponsible. After STDM, I am sure that I can judge people a lot better.

- - - - -

1. I expect to analyze our administration, as well as others.
2. I expected to learn something about CEGEP. A passing grade.
3. I found STDM interesting and different. The break STDM presented from the usual lectures was beyond description. Except for one other class, I never felt as comfortable in a classroom as in STDM. I feel one of the reasons it gave me this break was its informality.

This course has made me more aware of the educational system and its failure. Although we didn't make many decisions at the beginning of STDM, the course helped form decisions at the end.

- - - - -

1. a better understanding in certain topics;
2. Nil
3. I came today to help decide the plan STDM will follow next year; also to give my mark in.

- - - - -

1. I expect an interesting worthwhile time, and a better inside look of what I examine when the topic is finished. I don't want to be a pro on these topics, but I want a higher understanding of them.
2. A better understanding of each subject; to learn how a course is run and to get more self-discipline out of myself.

3. I came because I want this course to continue, and if I or no one else comes, then how will it survive? Also, I feel I'm obligated to come for the first time all year, because as I said above, it's for the good of the course.

- - - - -

1. A course that will be of interest, as it offers things which are interesting because it was designed by students. It will be different from other courses offered.
2. I don't really know what I expected from STDM. But I am certain one thing for sure, that is that I expected something totally different. I would like to achieve, through this course, some more knowledge on the modules I have chosen.
3. My goal of course at this point is I am still learning something. This course offers something different from all my other classes. It offers, in a way, a certain kind of freedom. There aren't any pressures, and no deadlines to meet.

- - - - -

1. Nil
2. I didn't really expect anything. This was a new course, and I was willing to try it. It would give me a chance to express my own opinions. Stupid as it may sound, I don't know what I expected to achieve through this course.
3. I would like to see this course changed and revised to make it better for students next year. I really feel this course could be a great leap if educational structure is revised properly. If we modified this course for next year, students would really get a lot out of it.

I know this course had a rough first year, but it has unknown potential; if only we could get this potential into good use.

1. To find out why being a student is so important;
3. To find out the evaluation of the course and what improvements can be made for next year, if the course should continue. I would like to hear people's comments on STDM and to find out if they have learned anything from it.

- - - - -

1. Nil
2. Omit - undecided
3. The goal of the course is to try to define my role as a student, and in order to do this, it would help if I knew how other people identify themselves in the role of a student. I want to know what decisions a student must make, how he must decide, and why he must decide things, and I can learn these things through the experiences and thoughts of other people.

- - - - -

1. I expect from this course to know something about Loyola College and how it functions and the student activism.
2. Being able to feel free, to express myself with no difficulty; to be able to make difficult decisions, to give my own ideas;
3. Whatever, you never know what could go on. I might learn something different, new. I've got nothing to loose, but to gain, so I might as well take the most out of it; new plans for next year; new ideas.

- - - - -

1. students role as a student; the school as an educational institution; the meaning of an education; the student in society; the educational system as a tool of learning.

2. I expect to find out why the hell I should still be going to school.
3. Being able to think for yourself without regurgitating the same crap some prof has shot at you for a term; better way to establish yourself with your ideals; learning that education isn't knowing what wall the name of the school hangs on, but rather what is contained therein, can do for you. You can come to class without being obligated. expressing what you feel; not having to confine your ideas to one topic because it is expected of you.

- - - - -

1. Analyze situations - get a point of view on these situations;  
Decide what to do about these situations;
2. a) a credit - some kind of knowledge about making snap decisions;  
b) I expect to learn about education.
3. - signed up for the course - my course;  
- want to see that will happen; sort of became attached to this course; don't want it down the drain;  
- actually, it's not a half-bad course.

That's it.

- - - - -

APPENDIX II.

Student Self-Evaluations

There was no grading of students in  
STDM. This was partly due to choice and  
partly due to economy of attention. What  
follows are the marks students gave  
themselves, along with their reasons for  
grading themselves so.

As for an evaluation of my STDM activities, I feel that 80 is the mark of my choice. It is my average. But as to my contributions, I have tried to become involved as a participant and as an initiator. STDM has been worthwhile to me, and I hope it continues.

- - - - -

My mark should be 80%. I haven't done anything outstanding and I dislike justifying myself, but I will anyway. Mt attendance was reasonable and I got involved in discussions when I thought them educating and interesting, but often personal conflicts between debaters threw us off the track and into general ideologies, etc. which usually got very boring. Other than that I found the atmosphere uninspiring for marks. Topics were often vague and therefore demanded much initiative which I don't possess a great deal of (not many people did). I was disappointed when our symposium became extinct because I went to every meeting and was hoping that something would happen but the very people who promised to get involved were absent from the meeting.

- - - - -

Mark: 74%

I marked myself on the basis of what I gained from the course, more than on the basis of how many lectures I attended. I found myself very involved in the lectures, meaning I found the subject interesting. That in itself makes a course worthwhile. I also tried to involve myself with the class as a group, but I found many people indifferent. An example of this is the symposium we never had.

- - - - -

It is very unlikely a student will be able to evaluate himself unbiasedly; however all students strive for the highest mark they can get. Credit-non-credit would be the simplest method of approach. All modules together, the mark would be 75%.

- - - - -

Mark: 68%

I gave myself this mark because of the outside work done for the modules. We prepared questionnaires, borrowed video machines, and visited other schools talking to students, and recording their views and ideas on video tape. We came up with some very interesting ideas at Dawson, and therefore, we showed the film at Dawson.

It was a very interesting idea and I enjoyed making this film.

- - - - -

Evaluation of my mark, since it's based on the percentage of 100, 75% is fine. Supported reason for this mark is unknown. Maybe I like myself that much.

- - - - -

I attended all the classes; was a member of the council; did as much work as I was requested to do (which was not much); am one of the few who was interested in the course. The work I have done for the course is more than the work the majority of the class did. When I compare what I did in the course to what the rest of the people did in the course, I feel that I should get an 80%. P.S. I consider STDm as a course, not a free credit. To enjoy STDm you must get involved in it. I got involved, so I enjoyed it. Involvement is the key to STDm - the only way to get something out of the course. I was involved, and I personally got something out of the course, even if it was only getting to know people and understand them better.

- - - - -

STDm was designed as a discussion course on the various levels of education. I feel that the most important word in the preceeding

sentence is discussion, and that the true function of the course was teaching communication between students and the formulation of ideas. I started the course as a complete introvert, unable to express my ideas freely. Attending the discussions and analysing how others communicated, I am now less of an introvert, and find myself able to communicate much more freely. I therefore believe that I have attained, to a considerable degree anyway, the goals of the course and deserve a 75%.

- - - - -

After much thought on the subject of a self-mark, I feel that giving myself a mark of 65% is fair and equitable. I reached this final mark by splitting the whole course into each of the four modules which I signed up for. I believe that this manner of evaluation is valid in that my participation in each particular course can be examined more carefully than if I judged it upon the course as a whole.

I felt that the main factors were: the work I did and the ideas that occurred for and during each module. There were cases where I obviously did more work in some modules than in others, but I feel that, as I stated above, 65% is a fair and above all honest mark. I could have put down something like 95% and attempted to explain it away under tons of rhetoric, but that would have helped no one.

- - - - -

Mark: 85%

I took the following four modules in this past year: 1) High School; 4) How Loyola Functions; 6) Issues in Higher Education; 8) Alternative Educational Structures;

For each module I set a certain goal which I strived to obtain. I was able to achieve my aims in three of these four modules. I divided the mark into four - 25 marks for each module. If my aims were achieved, a mark of 25 was recorded. I gave myself 10 marks for one module. Although I was unable to attain my aim, I did receive information which helped me understand the topic considerably more.

Three modules in which aims were achieved (3 X 25)	=	75%
Module in which aim was not achieved (1 X 10)	=	10%
Final Mark		<u>85%</u>

Mark = 50%

I feel I should at least have a pass. I admit I might not have participated in discussions as did other people. This course is extremely difficult to mark each other or yourself. There is no solid base or test to mark yourself on. I think I should have a pass because I took on and treated this course like I would take on any other course.

I feel that my mark should be 75%. I have based this mark on the amount of effort and interest that I have in this course, not in comparison to the other students in the course, but, rather, in comparison to my other subjects. I found the course to be exceptionally interesting and thought provoking even to the point of soul searching, and I devoted a lot of time to thinking about the course, something I really don't have to do in most of my other courses, where memory work is sufficient, but does not really satisfy my idea of education.

Mark = 77%

I found that I did do some work on the first module, and did do some readings on high school for my own interest. I did attend most of my modules, missing very few of them. I did do the readings that were required of me.

Mark = 66%

Reason: Mainly because I want to get a credit. Normally, with the amount of work that I did, I wouldn't get it, but since I'm the marker and I'm selfish, this is my mark. I may have not done much work, but the learning on my part was much, i.e. if an opportunity presents itself again, I would take full advantage of it.

- - - - -

What can I say? I want a 90%? I guess not. I didn't say hardly anything at all. A sentence or two at the beginning of the year - that's about it. But then, that's the way I am in all my courses, sorry. I showed up for most of my classes, no more than 2/3 of them, and not much less than that. Apart from just showing up, my participation was nil.

I can't evaluate myself apart from saying that I don't know where I'm going, or what I want, and that I really don't give a shit.

I guess a 65% would be nice, but it's up to you.

- - - - -

Mark = 85%

Justification: 1) work on student committee; 2) project;  
3) participation in more than the required amount of modules;  
4) participation actively in the course.

- - - - -

In reference to my grade, I feel that any grade except an E or D would be sufficient. Although I did not contribute a great deal to the class, I found the course informative and enlightening. My opinions on education would have only concerned schools in the U.S.,

so I withheld them. As STDM progressed, I found that the same problems existed in the U.S.'s educational system.

P.S. An A would be great!

- - - - -

Grade: 80%

Reason: At the risk of appearing ridiculous, I believe that the university institution serves the interests of the governmental and corporate elite and the upper and middle classes in their systematic domination and exploitation of the Québécoise. The university provides state bureaucracy and industrial capitalists with the specialized form of skilled labour power they require to fulfill their needs for human resources. This skilled labor power or intellectual labour power is of the type that those individuals developed are highly critical and skilled in their particular field, but uncomprehending and dull concerning the real political limit-situations imposed by the dominant class ideology upon their labor's goal and direction. In addition, the university serves to produce the highest legitimization of the status quo by encouraging the student populations to engage in politically facile and intellectually bankrupt analysis of their social and physical environment, under a façade of academic freedom.

To these purposes the entire emense structure of the university is put into motion to curtail true political interaction by students. Physical isolation is encouraged by physical classroom structure, overcrowding intensifies a continuation of an obsolete struggle for intellectual existence. And finally, emense student-oriented systems of student government, counselling, ombudsmen, social services etc. ad infinitum drain off potentially transformative student energies into projects, groups and programs which are doomed never to solve student problems because they are submerged in bureaucracy and oriented away from analyses of structure towards "legitimate", "responsible" reform attempts through established channels.

Yet for all its complexity, the base of all attempts to oppressively prescribe student life depends on the interaction between student and teacher in the classroom. The teacher is the immediate functionary of

the oppressive structure of responsible for the day-to-day, hour-to-hour control and domination of students. And for all its power and sanctions, the chief means, the only means to effectively control students while maintaining their non-threatening life-style, is the grade. Without the grade, the teacher becomes incapable of domination. The entire structure of the university collapses because that structure is one of oppression. It is a structure which functions to dominate. And when it can no longer coerce, threaten, bully and frighten students, it can no longer function.

If the grade existed, as some say, only to evaluate competence, then it would long ago have become obsolete, for there are far better ways to judge competence. The superiority and simplicity of actual competency exams has been consistently demonstrated at several poly-technical institutes in the U.S., especially Boston. No, the grade is there because it is the most efficient tool of its kind. But its purpose is not to measure, but intimidate.

Therefore, recognizing the true nature of the grade - oppression of students - I recognize and support all actions by any students, whether based on such an analysis as my own, or developing out of a simple laziness, or anti-authoritarianism, to subvert the grades purpose, to destroy its façade of credibility, and to blantly refuse to internalize the oppressor's corrupt conception of honesty. For the oppressor can do no right and the oppressed can do no wrong until the situation of oppression is finished, ended.

That 80 is there because I know that it means something - not to me - but to the oppressor and his functionaries and student dog allies - like a Jewish star of David patched on a coat - its absence would isolate me and any other student. So its there and if I had to I'd find some way to back it up. But lets not screw around and play pretend, I don't believe it.

And it better be the mark I see on my little white transcript sheet, or somebody's going to catch some shit, and I don't mean an argument.

- - - - -

Why do I give myself a mark for this course when in all honesty I don't feel I deserve one? I have learned nothing substantial; I have done little more than minimal work for any module, and I have had little communication with members of the course, student or coordinator. The sole positive thing that happened, and perhaps this is worth a million marks, was my individual learning process which developed considerably as a result of absorbing group interaction. I doubt that I've ever realized as well as during STDm the chaos incurred through democracy and freedom of choice. No one person is fully to blame for the disaster of the course: we are all at fault in some way. The attitude on the part of the students was more of "how much can I get for myself without doing any work". The impression was such that we felt that so long as no concrete work had to be produced, then no involvement at all was necessary: no sacrifice physically (i.e. assignments) nor mentally (participation and concern for the group, not just self). This course should exist without many changes, BUT for a more mature group of students. STDm is a CEGEP students's dream: no work, no involvement.

I have tried to keep a positive attitude. I have also made quite a few attempts at serious involvement. A 73% should be my mark: 65% for my record's sake, plus 8% for trying and coming out of STDm with my wits still about me. My thanks to all concerned.

---

### APPENDIX III.

#### Student Impressions of STDm

What follows are the undirected replies of the students to the question "what did you think of STDm"? The question was put after a certain amount of discussion on the course but before the preparation and administering of the Course Improvement Survey.

STDM COURSE EVALUATION

The course itself was a failure. In saying this I feel that the students themselves are failures. This is not an absolute statement because some of the students in the course can hardly be considered failures. I will say that about half of the people in this course had apparently such little interest and awareness that I can see no justification for having taken the course. I believe that just an awareness of the lack of initiative of students in general and an awareness of the importance of it would, if all of the students became aware of it, make the course a success. Personally, the course was a success as far as I am concerned, because I realized this and other aspects of student life, and of my identity as a student.

Basically, I believe that this is what the course was all about. It was an attempt to explore the student's situation as a decision-maker, member of society and individual. As such, the aims of the course were justified, and worth the effort. However, the lack of effort on the part of most students meant failure for the course.

- - - - -

Module: They were completely open to us; it was up to us to do whatever we wanted to. Some were organized and others weren't, but it didn't make any difference, it was up to us to do something about it. They were a bit short. We were short of time to get into the matters concerned.

Coordinators: They were very good. They did their best to get us involved as much as possible. Some were very interesting to listen to. They were a great help.

Course: The whole thing was very interesting. It was a good experience. I guess I'd take it again next year. The main reason is because you can choose a number of topics which will interest you.

- - - - -

The basic concept of STDM as a course where students are the decision-makers is a good one. This is a potentially rewarding

and educational course, but only insofar as the students are willing to make it work. Reluctantly I have come to the conclusion that potential members of STD M should be screened, possibly by a voluntary board of former STD M students. The reason I say this is because STD M, by its nature, is a group effort, and one individual can mess it up for the rest. Unfortunately, this year there were quite a few kids who came along just for the ride. I believe this is one very important factor in why STD M was not as successful as it might have been. Another factor to be considered is the size of the group. For a course such as STD M, even 25 students seems to represent a problem. Groups should be smaller and cut down into sections of 10 to 15 kids at the most.

If STD M is to be continued, I believe it would be valuable to have former STD M students as coordinators, seeing as they have the benefit of knowing where the pitfalls lie in this course.

I also think that the freedom granted the students should not be thrust at them all at once, but rather gradually given to those who desire it.

Don's recommendation for a gradual granting of freedom is a good one, and should be taken into consideration along with any other suggestions that may arise.

Another thing is that students should have more time to delve into a particular area of study. Perhaps a variety of topics could be offered, with the student having to choose only two or three during the year. A student may also wish to undertake a project in a particular area of study to be completed and handed in at the end of the year.

As for student evaluation, I believe self-evaluation should be maintained, but the student would have to produce a justification subject to review by perhaps a committee composed of students and coordinators.

In conclusion, I think that although some mistakes were made in the management of STD M this year, they can be rectified and STD M should continue.

- - - - -

I thought it was a great new idea for a new course, but after spending the first term, I found many faults, as following:

1. The modules are too short. The modules are only three weeks long. I feel they should be extended at least two weeks.
2. Too much time between modules; If you take the first two modules of this course, you don't have to attend anymore until the next term. Many people, like me for example, tend to lose interest in this course during the long waiting periods.
3. Not enough people participated. I can't say too much on this subject because, I admit, I did not participate too much myself. I think you should push mildly the people who comprise the silent majority in that particular discussion. If you sit and watch two or three people debate, you turn yourself off.
4. STDM Committee; Right from the start, I did not like this because it violates the concept of this course, which is that there is a ruling body. I don't believe the people who say: "This committee will represent you" and all your beefs. Bull! If I went to one and said I would like to see this committee dissolved, that particular person would not back my argument fully, like he is supposed to do.

#### Looking to the Future:

I think this course could go on for many more years with a few revisions.

I still believe you must set a few guidelines and limitations.

I have mentioned a few bad points. I think people still have to be pushed a little. I know I do.

- - - - -

I find it very difficult to evaluate this course, because I think that STDM has led me to new areas of education and learning,

but more than that it has led me to a better understanding of myself and other students. STDM has opened a new line of thinking for me, and this in itself makes it very different from my other courses. Perhaps I have not put as much "work" (i.e. essays, projects, exams) into this course as I have in others, but the learning level of STDM is different from other courses. To me, STDM was not a course to fill your head with facts and figures; rather, it was a course to develop and make me aware of my role as a student and a thinker, to the fullest extent possible, and consequently, I feel that the course was worthwhile.

- - - - -

I have found that this course did not meet my expectations. When registering, I thought that this course would be much harder and also would require a lot of work.

After the first module on high schools which I found very disorganized and uninformative, it seemed like this whole programme was completely unstructured and I was just hoping that the next module on CEGEPs would be better. At this point I had a real interest in this whole programme.

The second module did turn out to be better. It had more structure and organization. It did have some meaning to it. The speakers which were brought in did bring more light on the whole subject of CEGEP. My interest was sparked again in the whole programme. But slowly my enthusiasm was dropping for the whole course.

For my third module, again there was a certain interest. The module wasn't successful, and my enthusiasm dropped for the whole thing.

By the time my fourth module came around, I had little interest left. I found the module interesting, but the attendance for the module was very poor.

STDM started out with students who had a genuine interest in the course. But by the time the second semester came around, the interest had dropped drastically.

I found, on the whole, STDM was unsuccessful from my point of view.

- - - - -

After having completed all my modules in STDM  
I feel that I have learned something, but not all that I expected to.

I think that at the beginning, everyone was expecting to be taught as in High School, or as in any other course. We didn't realize that it was entirely up to us to decide what we wanted to talk about and do. When a discussion was started, it was usually limited between two or three people, and no one tried to stop them. We expected the coordinator to do so. I think we took for granted that everything was left up to the coordinator to do, when in fact it should have been us. By the end of the third module, people were starting to show lack of enthusiasm. Not many people would show up for meetings, either because they were not notified, which happened a couple of times, or they just didn't care anymore.

If STDM is continued next year, the modules should be longer. As this was the first time a course such as this one has been done, it is only natural that it does not run smoothly, and that mistakes were made along the way that will be corrected for next year.

- - - - -

The course had a lot of interest in the beginning. Everyone was running around, excited by the idea that they would learn to make decisions.

I still don't realize what they are trying to make decisions about.

The course deals with education, right? If it deals with education, why was it labelled 'Student as Decision-Maker'? To me, anyways, Student as Decision-Maker does not imply education. Maybe I'm just too stupid to see what you're talking about.

We saw a film about High School. O.K. Most of the people know what High School was like. Maybe their High School wasn't as good or as bad as the one in the movie, but they still knew generally what High School was like. But what did studying the film do towards amelioration of High Schools?

Then we got a film on University (McGill) which mentioned that students are apathetic. That's not big news. But the film didn't wipe out apathy because I didn't really watch the film. I only found out what it was about when someone mentioned what it was about.

STDM didn't do anything to help education. It was more a history on education, and you can't change history. Education changes slowly unless someone figures out something to change it quick, but then he's going to meet with a lot of obstacles.

The people in position won't step out of the way to let someone else try their luck. You're dealing with people, not machines or animals where you can predict what might happen. You're going to have some trouble trying to fix things to your specifications, and when you do, you're not going to want to step out and let someone else try.

The thing the course did better than any other course was let students speak up. Maybe if you made sure that people know exactly what the course was about, you'd have students enrolling who were really interested in the subject, and they'd put their heads together and come up with something.

I liked the idea of freedom in the course; maybe if it was about some other subject, not education, I might really have liked it.

- - - - -

I have to honestly admit that as time went by, I became more and more disenchanted with the STDM course. I know that a great deal (and probably most) of my dislike was through my own fault, but some of the mannerisms and styles of ideas that came up during the discussions also played a part in diminishing my desire to participate in the course.

For example, it became almost fashionable to tear down and ridicule the high school system as it now exists. I realize that high school is not perfect, but then nothing is. It almost seemed

as if the course were designed to change complacent, spoon-fed high schoolers into radical, fire-breathing college students, and this is where one of the faults of the STDN course lies; everyone felt that we had all the answers, and when we realized that we were only asking the same old questions, the effort decreased.

There were some bright spots in the course. It caused me to think more about how I am being educated, and that some aspects of high school and college could and did do more harm than good. But still, it seemed as if the prevailing atmosphere in most of the classes was that of pessimism, especially in the never-ending tale of how high school damaged us. I can't believe that out of all the STDN students enrolled, there was no one who felt that high school had any good to it.

The other point I want to bring up is the discussions. Most of the co-ordinators and some students felt that if someone did very little talking, then that person was getting nothing from the course. I believe this line of thought to be unfair, especially to the ones who naturally do not speak much in discussions. However, I suppose that there was no way the co-ordinators could know of this. On the whole, I would say that STDN was a modest success, but only modest. It could have been either a lot better, and a lot worse.

- - - - -

I chose this course because it was formed in the belief that "new, more effective approaches to teaching and learning are to be found in our educational institutions within the students themselves".

I was very intrigued by that idea that teaching can be formulated by each individual student. I found this to be true. The work done within the STDN modules was motivated not from a superior "teacher" force, but from the students themselves. I feel that this form of education is much more rewarding. I feel that a person finds more satisfaction when he or she achieves a goal which has been set by that person.

I felt that the topics which were discussed within the separate modules were very interesting, as well as relevant. The small

number of participants in each module was an asset in this type of learning experience.

I personally feel that this course has been extremely successful. I believe this form of learning is helpful, and should be expanded into different subjects.

I have but one complaint concerning this course. I feel that the idea of four, three-week modules was wrong. Three weeks (6 classes) is not nearly enough time to delve into certain topics. I believe that 2 three-week modules in the first term, and one six-week module in the second term would be more beneficial. The topics in the first term would be covered quickly by the participants. The students would thoroughly research a topic in the second term, since time would be more available.

<u>MODULE PLAN NOW</u>	<u>SUGGESTED MODULE PLAN</u>
First Term: 3-week module	First Term: 3-week module
3-week module	3-week module
Second Term: 3-week module	Second Term: 6-week modules
3 week module	

- - - - -

My evaluation of the course is just this. It began and ended. Now to evaluate this is kind of simple. At times I thought of it as a mistake, and other times I thought of it as a very interesting course. It depended on my attitudes towards the course module at the time they were given. Also, at times it served the educational benefits of learning. I don't really know how to evaluate a course like this. I can say it was great, wonderful and fantastic, but at the same time say it was a failure. I did learn from the course through the experience of taking it, and surviving through the year.

- - - - -

The course itself was not presented in an interesting manner, and eventually proved to be quite boring. Modules 3 and 7 were the two that held my interest and made anything mean something.

Alain Godbout and Don McMahon's modules were quite well done, yet the other two modules had really no meaning. The material covered was not important, and a lot of time was wasted on them.

The outside work that I did was actually what saved me, and kept me in this course.

- - - - -

Course: The course itself, still being in the experimental stage, was interesting, yet would rate average overall. There was too much to look forward to, and not enough done. Since no formal format was used, students were side-tracked and the subject matter all but evaded. Modules were mostly free-form rap seminars. The modules were of such short duration that they seemed to work against participation. Although the time factor was a dissident factor, the course was motivating and thought provoking.

Suggestions: Next year, the course should have four (4) modules at the most. This would mean incorporating two modules with the same scope of ideas. Education, social structures etc. In other words, there should be a regrouping of similar topics under one heading.

Module Co-ordinators: On the average, there could have been a little more enthusiasm toward the topics, debates and seminars would improve this. Improvement could be made by introducing different hypothesis of a nature to be 'torn-apart'. In educational and social matters, exchange professors for students for a few days to give the students the feel of being in someone else's shoes, so to say. Experience is the best teacher. Perhaps this would increase student-faculty relations.

- - - - -

- NO -

I found myself very involved in the lectures, meaning I found the subject interesting. That in itself makes a course worthwhile. I also tried to involve myself with the class as a group, but I found many people indifferent. An example of this is the symposium we never had. Regardless of this, I think STDm was a worthwhile course, and with a little more control, it should be continued next year. It's a new concept for many. It's strange at first: no rules, no professors, no texts. There were mistakes made by both the students and course administrators, but that is to be expected. Next year, it will be that much better.

Also, maybe the course applicants should be screened. They should be totally aware of what the course is about, how it's run. The only concrete work I have to show is a film I did. It's now stored at Viger Campus (Dawson). We showed the film to Dawson students (friends of ours). Our technical work wasn't too good though. The film was fun, as well as educational.

- - - - -

The course was a very good idea, and left ample room for us students to take initiative. Unfortunately, much more preparation should have been made for its outlines and goals. Many times, good discussions were started, but nothing ever evolved from them. No concrete accomplishments have been made, but still this first year of STDm has not been totally wasted, for it will help the coordinators understand the problems that affected the course, and should help them to prepare the course more adequately next year. Our apathy, in my opinion, comes from lack of discipline and our fear of responsibility.

I seriously think that if next year STDm continues, many changes in the course's structure should be made. Modules should be seriously put in question and topics and data compiled during the summer so as to quickly get started next year. I think some form of committee should be set up to investigate the possibilities of the course, as I feel that it is our responsibility to ensure the success of the course next year. I sincerely think that this could mean an interesting chance for some of this year's students to do something worthwhile and useful. Maybe then, if some of us still wanted to give STDm another try, we might feel more involved and interested in the course.

- - - - -

... 40

I think that STDM was, and still is, a good idea. I don't think that our problems were avoidable. The students probably felt that they could handle all of the demands made upon the course. Modules, also were a poor idea. We dealt with too many topics, and the time given was much too short. Next year there should be no modules, but instead, small groups of people with 1 or 2 coordinators studying all aspects of learning and education. On the subject of coordinators, I don't think that they were well enough prepared for their modules. One exception to this were coordinators for module 7. Eric and Shelly were able to keep interest up, and everyone was working at something. I find it difficult to believe that STDM is not worthwhile. It should be offered as a course next year. And it should use students who were in the course as advisors and possibly coordinators.

- - - - -

It was a different type of course than the standard college courses. The structure of the course made it possible for the members of the class to discipline themselves, and to work at the speed that they wanted to. This is fine for some students, but others (the majority of the class) cannot handle the freedom. The course, as it progressed, got better and better. Having been in modules 2, 4, 5 and 8, I can say that the course was a success, but having heard what happened in the other four modules, I would have to say that the course was a success. The thing that failed was the little matter which is referred to as students. The course passed, but the students failed.

The course should go on next year, but there should be a lot of changes. 1) change the name of the course, because the students misuse the power of decision-making; 2) The course should be continuous - no three-week sessions. Small independent groups that cover the material that the group wishes to cover in the amount of time needed to cover it properly are required. 3) Evaluation should be handled by the group that a student is in. 4) There should be a screening session before anyone is let into the course. With these four simple changes, the course should be a complete success next year.

- - - - -

At the risk of appearing ridiculous, I believe that the university institution serves the interests of the governmental and corporate elite, and the upper and middle classes in their systematic domination and exploitation of the Quebecoise. The university provides state bureaucracy and industrial capitalists with the specialized form of skilled labour power they require to fulfill their needs for human resources. This skilled labor power or intellectual labor power is of the type that those individuals developed are highly critical and skilled in their particular field, but uncomprehending and dull concerning the real political limit-situations imposed by the dominant class ideology upon their labor's goal and direction. In addition, the university serves to produce the highest legitimization of the status quo by encouraging the student populations to engage in politically facile and intellectually bankrupt analysis of their social and physical environment, under a façade of academic freedom.

To these purposes the entire immense structure of the university is put into motion to curtail true political interaction by students. Physical isolation is encouraged by physical classroom structure, overcrowding intensifies a continuation of an obsolete struggle for intellectual existence. And finally, immense student-oriented systems of student-government, counselling, ombudsmen, social services etc. ad infinitum drain off potentially transformative student energies into projects, groups and programmes which are doomed never to solve student problems because they are submerged in bureaucracy and oriented away from analyses of structure towards "legitimate", "responsible" reform attempts through established channels.

Yet for all its complexity, the base of all attempts to oppressively prescribe student life depends on the interaction between student and student and student and teacher in the classroom. The teacher is the immediate functionary of the oppressive structure responsible for the day-to-day, hour-to-hour control and domination of students. And for all its power and sanctions, the chief means, the only means to effectively control students while maintaining their non-threatening life-style, is the grade. Without the grade the teacher becomes incapable of domination, and the entire structure of the university collapses because that structure is one of oppression. It is a structure which functions to dominate. And when it can no longer coerce, threaten, bully and frighten students, it can no longer function.

If the grade existed, as some say, only to evaluate competence, then it would long ago have become obsolete, for there are far better ways to judge competence. The superiority and simplicity of actual competency exams has been consistently demonstrated at several poly-technical institutes in the U.S., especially Boston. No, the grade is there because it is the most efficient tool of its kind. But its purpose is not to measure, but intimidate.

Therefore, recognizing the true nature of the grade - oppression of students - I recognize and support all actions by any students whether based on such an analysis as my own, or developing out of a simple laziness, or anti-authoritarianism, to subvert the grades purpose, to destroy its façade of credibility, and to blantly refuse to internalize the oppressor's corrupt conception of honesty. For the oppressor can do no right and the oppressed can do no wrong until the situation of oppression is finished, ended.

That 80 is there because I know that it means something - not to me - but to the oppressor and his functionaries and student dog allied - like a Jewish star of David patched on a coat - its absence would isolate me and any other student. So it's there, and if I had to I'd find some way to back it up. But let's not screw around and play pretend, I don't believe it.

And it better be the mark I see on my little white transcript sheet, or somebody's going to catch some shit, and I don't mean an argument.

#### CHANGES:

1. Make the course - under a different name - a core area. (see #4)
2. Make modules 8 and 6 and 7 together, half courses.
3. Make module on high school another half course - but get someone in who has some guts and knows what he is talking about, not afraid to tell it like it is, i.e. not Val.
4. Junk this student freedom façade. It only encourages misconceptions and bitterness.
5. If you want students to be radical, live your radicalism - don't become conservative. If you want students to have guts, main chose.

APPENDIX IV.

Course Improvement Survey

This questionnaire was  
compiled by the course co-ordinator,  
drawing on a bank of questions suggested  
by several small teams of students working  
on the idea of a survey.

What did you think of the name of the course: "Student as Decision-Maker"?

- very disorientating; should have been more precise;
- In terms of what was done in the course this year - it is irrelevant.
- applies well to the course;
- It had nothing to do with the course.
- It was not representative of the course.
- Too vague - should be more specific;
- did not prepare the students (gave them too much in one shot);
- does not tell of the course's goal;
- name doesn't really describe the course;
- It implies something that was not incorporated in the course;
- I think it is an appropriate name. It tells what the course is.
- expressed exactly what the course was offering;
- misleading;
- accurate but vague;
- The name describes the course well. It sums up the whole purpose of the course.
- It described, in a way, what the course was about.
- It did not describe the course properly.
- not bad;

Should it be changed?

- Yes
- Yes
- No
- Yes
- X
- Yes
- -
- No
- Yes
- Yes
- No
- No
- Yes
- Yes
- No
- No
- X
- Makes no difference;

If so, what is your suggestion?

- Methods of Education;
- Say it's a course (relatively unstructured) with modules;
- -
- A Study of Education;
- -
- Students' Role In Society;
- -
- -
- Got no suggestion - but should describe course;
- An Experiment in Learning; or Education As A Science; Educational Science;
- -
- maybe: Education Prospectives
- -
- -
- -
- Re-evaluation of the theme of STDM should formulate a new name;
- Quebec Studies X108;

What do you think of the way in which the course was presented to you in September?

- very general; no precise goal; not enough structure;
- sounded nice, but too idyllic;
- N.A.
- I had no clear idea on what to expect;
- I didn't know that much about it.
- It was presented as thoroughly as possible.
- It was pretty well put together.
- well presented;
- I personally didn't understand it.
- It could have been made more clear.
- I thought it was presented unclearly.
- The whole idea of the course was still vague.
- -
- It seemed to be an ineffective compromise between structure and non-structure.
- There were too many things left unclear and undefined.
- Didn't let you know exactly what the modules that you chose were about.
- It should be more structured.
- Did not quite understand the course's aim.

Did it seem to have a clear goal? If so, what was that goal?

- No. -
- No. -
- No. -
- No. I don't know.
- No. -
- No. -
- - It didn't have anything clear, but it had something.
- No. -
- No. -
- No. -
- Yes; To see if students could run a course by themselves.
- Theoretically; deciphering the educational process.
- No. -
- No. The importance of student involvement in any form of education;
- No. -
- No. -
- Yes. Experiencing, experimenting - but everyone got lost in their surroundings.
- No. -

Was that goal achieved?

- -
- -
- No.
- -
- -
- -
- -
- -
- Don't know.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- -
- No.
- -
- x
- No.
- Not really.

Do you think you were ready for a course like this?

- Partly;
- Yes: I was willing to do independant work with some group association and help.
- No: because the course was too chaotic; interests were spread over too wide an area to make things interesting.
- Yes.
- No.
- Not really;
- No.
- No.
- Yes.
- Don't know;
- 50-50;
- No.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- No.
- No.
- No.
- Yes.
- Most probably;

What should be the goal of next year's course?

- \* A course in which students would have to participate so there would have to be structures: topics, projects resembling Quebec Studies, and in this way learning to understand different means of communication;
- \* A more structured course that is also pliable according to students' needs; less broad topics for modules;
- \* If you can keep the class together and work as a group, any goals can be achieved; just a class cooperating as one unit achieves a goal in itself.
- To have each student emerge with a clear notion of what education is all about.
- \* To be a bit more structured at the beginning of the year, and then later on let the students take over.
- To show the student what kind of force he weilds as a student; what he can change and what he can't;
- (1) to prepare the people before the course starts;
- (2) then accelerate slowly to maximum speed;
- To delve into this type of education more thoroughly - wider scope;

- I really didn't understand what the co-ordinators wanted.
- To be able to look at education objectively and critically;
- -
- -
- To give the student a semi-selfdirective course;
- The same as I have stated;
- That the student should understand and accept his role as a student (i.e. the student should be able to learn independantly);
- -
- More involvement, more student participation - small groups (8) finding themselves in a structured thing and working outward, breaking the structures if necessary.
- -

How would you compare this course with your other courses?

- Very loose, did not get the students interest;
- Class-wise, I learned nothing, but I learned a lot about unrestricted freedom and people in groups, which I never learned in other courses. It has potential.
- My other courses are independent studies courses. It fits in well.
- My other courses were well organized; this one was not.
- It was different. I didn't have any work to do. You got to evaluate yourself.
- No better - no worse. Some of my courses are freely-structured (i.e., little homework) and some aren't.
- Completely different; You need a stronger personality.
- Much more enjoyable; better learning atmosphere;
- More relaxed, not very certain - Lots of ideas, good potential.
- All my courses this year were interrelated, so they compared rather favorably.
- Very different - all the responsibility is put on you. It is a completely different course.
- In all fairness to the course, there was no comparison. Students "were" the class, instead of being part of it.
- Easier - better;
- Better than all (except Theology);
- This course was a valuable learning experience. It was not strictly lecturing and memorizing as all my others are.
- More freedom in letting you choose what you want.
- It has so much more potential than any of the other courses. I was keen when starting, and have learned a lot about students and how they feel when they are put in this type of situation.

- Some of our lectures were good, but I liked the idea of the modules.

How well do you feel this course was administered?

- The coordinators gave it a good try, but this was new to them, and they lacked preparation to compensate for their inexperience.
- Lots of enthusiasm on the part of the main organizers, but no real co-ordination amongst them.
- Too general a question;
- The entire module format was a poor idea.
- 
- Quite well. The coordinators were facing the same newness that we were.
- As well as the students wanted (too little too soon).
- Well. It was a new experience for the administrators.
- Coordinators were good; objectives were not clear.
- For the most part the coordinators knew their stuff.
- Considering it was the first year, I thought it was administered well.
- Very well, considering it being a novelty.
- Not bad.
- Poorly on the students' part;
- As the modules progressed, from the 1st. to the 8th., it improved.
- 
- Much effort and great interest, but only on the part of a few administrators.
- 

Were you satisfied with the module coordinators? (Comments on individual coordinators are welcome.)

- They were very persistent and patient, but did not have enough structures. They relied too much on the students' capability to easily adapt to complete freedom. Students had never before had so much responsibility
- Some showed interest in running a class where they were teacher more than coordinator. Some could not interest any of their students in even class participation.
  - I think Alain and Don did a fine job. I don't know whether this was due to experience, or what, but they both seemed most involved.
  - Most of the coordinators did not seem to know what they were doing. I felt that the only coordinators who knew what they were doing were those from modules 5 and 8.

- In general, yes. I was totally dissatisfied with the first module because it was too hard to accept something which was totally unstructured. And it just seemed to exist from day to day and module 6.
- Most were good; some felt that the students were to do everything with little help from the coordinator herself. I feel that students need a bit of guiding.
- Yes.
- Yes; all seemed interested in their specific module.
- Yes. Alain Godbout and Don McMahon were really interested. Pretty good.
- Yes, but there was a lot of apathy on the students' part at the beginning.
- Yes, except for one, the one in charge of the first module. He let the discussions wander off.
- Val needs a little more shaping-up, but as a rule the coordinators were efficient and well prepared.
- Val - no. Don B. - yes. Don M. - yes. Pierre - no. Jenny - yes.
- Their ineffectivity was due only to the lack of interest on the part of most students.
- Generally, yes. They all did their best to make the modules as interesting and valuable as possible, especially for modules 2 and 8, though I did find module one to be rather slow.
- Yes.
- General impression was that the course demanded much more time than the coordinators were able to give. I genuinely feel that not all gave as much effort as they could.
- Quite satisfied. Allan Godbout and Don McMahon - very good job.

How do you think the module coordinators handled the problems of STDM?

- To their best capabilities and they should not be blamed for the failures of STDM.
- Some ignored them and/or blamed the students for them (Graeme Decarie). Most thought (seemed to me) that they were blameless.
- Too casually;
- We did not hear from coordinators enough between modules to know that was happening.
- No comment.
- There were a lot of snags, but the coordinators handled them quite well, I think.
- Some did just as little work as the students - others did more. The students balanced (in work done) to the
- -
- Lots of problems. Coordinators did good.
- Great!

- -
- The best way they knew how.
- Poorly.
- The only people who should have handled the problems were the students.
- Very well; they did not accept the responsibility of decision-making for the students; they forced them into the role of the deciders.
- Seeing as it was the first time for most of them in doing something like this, they handled it well.
- It depended on the individual. Mr. Decarie, for instance, accepted the problems, but made it clear they were the students'.
- Not too quickly or efficiently.

What did you think of students acting as coordinators?

- Made students feel more relaxed;
- Has potential provided they are mature enough to handle it;
- Excellent !!!
- I think that it would be a valuable experience for all.
- I think it's a great idea because they can more easily get across to the students.
- No difference; in my eyes they were the same as professors.
- Yes.
- Great idea - helps learning atmosphere having peers "teach";
- Nice try. They did pretty good.
- Not so good unless they know their stuff as the coordinators;
- I think it would be a good idea.
- Created more interest and greater rapport between students and coordinators;
- Hell no.
- -
- Good idea;
- The students will have to be sure that they want to take on the task and not back out.
- Great!
- Excellent.

Do you think there are some STDM students who would make good coordinators for next year?

- Yes, but they would have to start preparing themselves now!
- No! still too young and/or narrow-minded and/or too opinionated.

- Yes - 2 or 3;
- Yes;
- Yes;
- Yes;
- Yes;
- Yes;
- Some;
- -
- Yes - a couple;
- -
- Probably - they certainly want to.
- Few;
- Yes;
- No.
- No recommendations;
- Yes!

What did you think of the actual content of the modules? (Comments on individual modules are welcome.)

- Useful and interesting, but often too general and sparse;
- There was little content. Most of the time we spent discussing why we were all lazy.
- I found Alain's and Graham's the most interesting. Alain's seemed to be the most organized by far. Don's was too loose.
- They were all too vague except for 8.
- I found that the modules were interesting, offering different aspects of education. I didn't especially like the module on high schools, and the module 6.
- The ones in the first term seemed directed towards a concrete goal, but the ones in the second term seemed more abstract, and had little purpose or direction.
- I enjoyed all the modules that I attended: 2, 4, 5 and 8.
- Most modules left contents up to the students - good idea since contents would be of interest to all.
- I personally didn't like what the modules were about.
- High School - so-so; but the best were Alternative Structures of Education and some other one I can't remember.
- -
- Judging from participation and overall appeal, it was great.
- High School: shit; Educational Alternatives - Don McMahon's: excellent; Jenny and Don B. - excellent;

- I do not agree with the modular idea because what in effect happens is you get the module coordinators doing their own thing which may not correspond to the students.
- Module 2 and module 8 were excellent modules. They contained very useful background information that encouraged and interested students to do projects.
- Modules 2 and 5 were the two that I got the most out of.
- There wasn't enough time to really get enough content for all the modules.
- There wasn't really any "meat on the bone". It consisted of very loose topics for discussion.

Are there any modules that should be scrapped? (Specify)

- I think the whole idea of modules should be scrapped.
- Loyola's Development - What is Education was good, but too broad a topic.
- -
- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7
- No.
- I can't honestly say either way.
- -
- ?
- Don't know for sure;
- -
- -
- Perhaps not scrapped, but amalgamated;
- High School and How Loyola Functions;

- All of them;

- "

- No.

- History of Loyola could be interesting if it's goals were changed;

- Yes.

Can you think of new topics? (Specify)

- They would have to have direct relations with education.

- Topics dealing with people, not just students;

- "

- All aspects of education;

- "

- "

- "

- Less on education; more on lines of community assistance;

- "

- "

- "

- Scholarly aptitude and the marking system;

- Student organizing as practice;

- No, but students should be encouraged to persue topics of personal interest;

- "

- No.

- My idea of what the course should be does not recommend specific appointed topics;
- ?

Were the module topics specific enough? Were the discussions realistic?

- No. Yes, but too general and often completely off course;
- No. Not really; too abstract ("they" say; "they" do - never "we")
- Yes. Yes.
- No. No.
- Yes, but some weren't. Yes and No.
- Yes. Generally, yes.
- Yes. -
- Yes. Not all.
- Guess so. Yes.
- They interrelated. To a great extent, yes.
- Yes. Some were way off;
- No. Too many ideas and too narrow a subject;
- Yes. Not usually - but sometimes;
- No, Overly academic;
- Yes. Yes.
- No. -
- Yes. At times there were personality conflicts.
- No. Realistic - Yes; Worthwhile - No;

- Would you like to have more or less of these methods of teaching/learning:

<u>Lectures:</u>	<u>Guest Speakers:</u>	<u>Written Assignments:</u>	<u>Reading Assignments:</u>
more	more	more	more
more if the format of STDM remains same	more	according to individual interests	according to indiv- idual interests only
less	more	-	more
more	more	more	more
more	more	no	no
same	more	same	same
-	-	-	X
less	more	less	less
-	X	-	-
-	more	less ?	more
less	more	more	more
more	more	-	more
less	more	-	more
no	yes	no	no
less	more	individual choice	more
less	more	less	more
-	more	research	more
more	more	less	-
<u>Individual Projects:</u>	<u>Group Projects:</u>	<u>Student Presentations:</u>	<u>Exams:</u>
more	more	more	no
according to indiv- idual interests only	not necessary	-	none
more	more	-	-
more	more	more	none
yes and no	more	no	no
less	less	same	same
-	-	-	-
more	more	more	less
-	-	X	-
less	more	more	less
more	less	less	less
more	-	more	-
more	more	more	none
yes	yes	yes	no
individual choice	individual choice	more	No!
less	more	more	less
if so desired by the individual	more	more	NO
-	more	more	none

<u>- Discussions:</u>	<u>Individual Tutors:</u>	<u>Films:</u>	<u>Assigned Texts:</u>
less	less	more	more
-	more	more	none
		(except the one Don McMahon showed!)	
fine	-	more	-
less	more	more	more
no	no	yes	yes
same	less	more	less
X	-	X	-
more	less	more	less
X	-	X	-
more	more	more	more
less	less	more	less
more	-	more	up to the individual
more	-	-	none
yes	yes	yes	no
less	more	more	no
more	less	more	less
more - more people	made available	more	no
more talking	-	more	less

Are there any other methods you would recommend? (Specify)

- -
- Let people get out of the classroom more!
- Field trips;
- That there be no modules, and very small groups (3 or 4);
- No.
- -
- -
- More learning through experience;
- -
- -
- I thought Don's method was really great.
- -
- -
- -
- -
- No.
- A few two hour or so excursions to places of interest;
- -

What did you think of the module system?

- No good - the class should have followed the same programme, but being divided in groups of 4 or 5 doing certain projects on education: film and audio-visual.
- Too short - should have been more topics (subjects); if X number of students interested in one topic should be allowed to start their own module if this hasn't been done already;
- Good system if well administered, but modules were too short.
- It was awful.
- I didn't like the module system because some modules should have been larger while some should have definitely been much shorter;
- It was good, the problem being that some module may be crowded, while others were deserted.
- Much too short - the length should be decided in the module as it progresses. One module should stay together for at least one term (with changing or not changing their topic).
- Fine idea; I would like less modules with a longer duration.
- Keeps a person hopping; more modules = wider range of topics; fewer modules = more detailed study of topics;
- Were too short;
- It is alright except they are too short and sometimes there is too much time between modules.
- Good, except for length. Modules should be grouped for more time and in-depth research.
- Fragmentary - not coherent;
- I am against it because it represents an attempt to channel student interests.
- Very successful, though the modules should be longer.
- They should be longer than three weeks, and maybe not offer as many as 8.
- Should be longer - students should not have to enlist in a specific module.
- Love it - Very good idea;

Should there be fewer or more? Should they be smaller or larger (i.e. no. of students)?

- No. -
- More. - Smaller, absolutely!
- Fewer. - Smaller.
- None. - None.
- Fewer. - Smaller.
- Can't say; Some larger, some smaller;
- Fewer; Small - 4 or 5;
- Fewer. - Smaller;
- Don't know. - -

- Fewer; -
- Fewer; Smaller;
- Fewer; Smaller;
- Fewer; Some smaller; some larger;
- More; Smaller;
- Fewer; -
- Fewer; 10;
- Fewer; Smaller;
- Same; Same;

Should there be "off periods" between modules? Should there be different coordinators for each module?

- " "
- one week; yes;
- yes; -
- no; no modules;
- yes; yes;
- yes; no;
- no; no;
- no; yes;
- yes; -
- no; yes;
- yes; yes;
- below; yes;
- yes; yes;
- " yes;
- no; yes;
- no; yes;
- maybe one week; yes;
- yes; yes;

Further comments:

- Different coordinators for different topics (having a detailed programme of course);
- Should be open to university students too;
- "
- Modules do not offer enough time for in-depth study;
- Because it lets you see things from a different light there should be a coordinator for every module;
- "

- "
- "
- All coordinators together each specializing in one module;
- Make 'em longer;
- For "off periods" I only mean one or even two at the most;
- Off-periods only on as for constructive work pertaining to the subject matter;
- "
- A good number for a module is 2 or 3 interested students;
- "
- "
- The basic idea of modules is good theoretically, but not practically.
- "

Did you prefer to meet in A315; LSA building; coordinator's home/office, or other (Specify)?

- LSA building;
- A315 is convenient, but excursions should be arranged to get students out of them; coordinator's office when convenient;
- "
- home;
- coordinator's office;
- A-315;
- "
- LSA building;
- A-315;
- Makes no difference;
- "
- "
- office/home;
- Anything but A315;
- Classroom atmosphere is too confining;
- Coordinator's office/home;
- Alternating places is good;
- No preference;

What did you think of self-evaluation?

- The only way to realistically evaluate this year of STDm;
- Very good;
- I'm more in agreement with contracts;

- It was a good idea.
- I think it's great.
- Everyone thinks differently, so self-evaluation was the best and safest bet.
- For STDN it was the only way that you could evaluate.
- Good for some; develops sense of responsibility to self;
- Pretty good - get to know yourself better - more honest with self;
- The greatest invention since the pen!
- Yes it is good, except most people grade themselves too hard.
- Good decision-maker;
- Great;
- A good idea. Hopefully it was used with responsibility;
- Good idea;
- It was a good idea, as we are the only ones who can judge what we have accomplished.
- Good, but the people this year, I don't think were ready;
- Very good;

Would you like to be evaluated by your fellow student(s)?

- No.
- No.
- No.
- Yes.
- No.
- No.
- -
- No.
- No.
- Sure.
- No.
- O.K.
- Sure.
- No.
- -
- No.
- -
- Yes.

Would you like to be evaluated by your module coordinator?

- No.
- No.

- "
- No.
- No.
- Possibly;
- "
- No.
- No.
- O.K.!
- Yes.
- "
- Sure.
- No.
- "
- No.
- "
- No.

Would you like to be evaluated by another person (specify)?

- "
- Yes, by a module coordinator or other students who can know what you learn by seeing and hearing and talking to other people. They cannot judge what you absorb if they don't know you. Someone who knows you well should be an estimator (mothers, if they know you best, included!)
- Contract;
- "
- Yes;
- It all depends. No one knows anyone else to any full extent.
- I would like to see a group evaluation. A number of students that have been with you all through the course;
- No. Self-evaluation is only true manner of marking.
- No.
- "
- "
- "
- Sure, but not graded.
- No. I feel that I am the only person capable to evaluate me.
- The way I was graded did not especially matter.
- No.
- Yes. Someone (or more) who is assigned for it specifically i.e. interview, essay oral presentations, or anything.
- No.

Should STDM have been a half-credit? Would you have taken it as a half-credit?

- No; No;
- No; No; Had I known that STDM would turn out as it did, I wouldn't have taken it at all - credit or not.
- No; No;
- No; Yes;
- No; Yes;
- No; Maybe;
- Yes; Yes;
- No; Yes;
- No; No;
- No; No;
- Yes; Yes;
- Yes; No;
- No; Maybe;
- No; No;
- Yes; Yes;
- No; No;
- Choice of 1/2 or full credit should be made at beginning of year, and the person should work accordingly;
- No; ?

Should it have been a non-credit? Would you have taken it as a non-credit course?

- - No;
- No; No;
- No; No;
- No; Not sure;
- No; Yes;
- No; No;
- - No;
- No; No;
- Maybe; Maybe;
- No; No;
- No; No;
- No; No;
- No; No;
- Yes; No;
- No; No;
- No; No;
- No; No;

Should the coordinators have exercised more control over the course?

(Explain)

- Yes - not so much liberty of action in class participation; obligation to hand in projects;
- Not more control: There should have been more structure built into STDm from which BOTH coordinators and students would have had to work together to modify according to individual needs.
- Yes. Some students are new to such a system. Control is needed, but can be lessened as course goes on;
- No, but they should have given more council to the students;
- No, because then it would have lost all its meaning, and just been like all other courses;
- Not the idea of control, but more guiding was needed; Throwing a bunch of kids together and instructing them to talk didn't work;
- No, the students should have exercised more control. The coordinators should have made the students realize this.
- No, that would defeat the cause: student as a decision-maker.
- Control exercised was the right amount;
- In directing the studies, yes;
- A little more. They should have pushed mildly, the students who weren't saying much;
- Not unless the group was prone to being lazy and apathetic;
- No.
- No, the less external authority that students experience may make them rely on an internal authority;
- Yes, until students could adjust to this new system of learning, and then it should be totally left up to the student;
- No, as it was up to the students themselves to make sure that the people stayed on the topic;
- More personal interest, but maybe that was not possible;
- They should have had a course guide or some idea of what was happening;

Who should decide about module topics, assignments, and student evaluation?

Explain

- The future coordinators decided by students after they have registered for the course and know its content and obligations;
- Organizers initially with the understanding that mature students who wanted to change it could. Evaluation should stay as is.
- Students and Moderators - They are administrators, we are students, and should work together.

- Students through voting;
- The students along with the coordinators because they could help guide the students into not making any serious mistakes;
- Both coordinators and students;
- The module;
- Students - that's what the course title refers to;
- Students and Coordinators working together;
- The coordinators;
- The students and the coordinators;
- It should be students, since it is a student-run course;
- Students, but let splits be splits;
- Students - it's our course;
- Anyone who feels qualified, but it should be the students' choice who grades him;
- Students should decide as that is what the course is about; They should be able to make their own decisions.
- 
- Students and module coordinators and "Gerry Gross";

What did you think of the student coordinating council?

- Should have been made earlier in the year; more contact with students;
- Useless;
- 
- It was a good idea, but no one took advantage of it.
- I think in a way they were ineffective because they put the burden of planning certain things on a few people.
- Good idea; It gave a student a say in his education, albeit a small one.
- Students had no connection with the council, in this way the council did not know what the students wanted.
- USELESS - ALL students should make decisions.
- Good idea, but some were full of shit.
- Didn't do a blessed thing;
- In a course such as this, I dislike any governing body or representative.
- 
- Ineffective;
- Ineffective because it was not clear what was expected of it.
- Could be effective, but they did not really have the cooperation of the rest of the students;
- That not too much came out of it; Still seemed to be going around in circles;
- Should have been compulsory from the beginning;
- Don't know enough about it;

What should the role of the student be in this kind of a course?

- Actively participating in the course with the coordinators;
- An interested person - interested in learning from a group, not just from one person; Interested in participating;
- Students should be involved in the course and work along side moderators;
- Recipients of information, and developers of new techniques;
- He should be free to express himself; be able to go to what he feels interests him; students should have a definite interest in such a thing;
- To acquire an awareness of himself as a student; the student coordinators have to work together, since some ideas were as new to them as they were to us.
- The students should get involved in the course. That way they would be interested in the course.
- MAJOR ROLE - have a part in everything;
- Help himself learn;
- Not a decision-maker, but a suggestor, opinion giver; and a critic of present education;
- -
- He should be the person with the questions, answers, conclusions and objections.
- To organize and develop alternatives;
- It should be a role that students would evolve during the year.
- -
- Don't know;
- ACTIVE!
- -

How should the acceptance of students into the course operate?

- The same way as before, only the students taking this course would have to know what are its qualifications;
- University students; a limited number, unless if more students added, an equal number of coordinators to match;
- Screening by moderators and ex-STDM students;
- By interview of applicant of certain attributes;
- It should find out those who would truly fit into such a programme, and it should be offered to II CEGEP students only;
- Anyone who feels they are able to take the course should be given a chance to enter;
- Should screen and prepare the student before acceptance;
- ?
- Short try-out period;
- Regular enrolment;

- A talk with the new students should be conducted to see what they want in this course;
- A planned course outline and interest to work;
- Large scale recruitment on the basis of each group's (student) needs;
- All who are interested;
- All students should be accepted, as long as they show an interest in the course;
- Anyone should be allowed to take this course;
- They should be screened.
- No suggestions - possible interview, screening board; STDm is not for everyone.

If you were interviewing students interested in taking STDm, what qualities would you look for?

- Responsible; hardworking; very open to other people; very outgoing student;
- Maturity and interest; a serious attitude toward learning from people (and not necessarily from books); If you let someone speak their mind, you must also be ready to accept them for what they say whether you like it or not.
- Awareness, sense of responsibility;
- A person who would be interested, and be willing to voice ideas in discussion;
- To be able to work on his own; to not be looking for a free credit; to have a genuine interest in the course;
- How well they thought and formed ideas. I would NOT look for someone who only discussed things. Some people are not "talkers".
- Responsibility;
- Enthusiasm;
- None;
- First of all, I would screen them; but would look for some type of initiative;
- If they are open minded and ready for discussion, and to take on some responsibility;
- Project ideas, broad-minded, personality appeal and background;
- A wish to go deeper than the ordinary answers and misconceptions;
- Interest!
- Interest, and a desire to be able to do independant studies without compulsory supervision;
- Interest and a real desire to take part in the different modules;
- (1) Maturity - seriousness concerning their education;
- (2) objectives and goals; (3) interest in other students in the course; willingness to participate;
- Acceptance of working alone;

If you had known what you know now of STDm, would you still have enrolled in this course last September?

If you had the opportunity to enroll in the new, modified course next year, would you?

- No; Yes;
- No; Maybe; depending on modifications;
- Yes; Yes;
- Not sure; Yes;
- Yes; Yes;
- Yes; I don't know.
- Yes; Yes;
- Yes; Yes;
- Probably; Gotta see;
- Yes; Maybe;
- Yes; Yes;
- Yes; Possibly;
- Yes; Yes;-
- Yes; Yes, if I was satisfied with the modifications;
- Yes; Most probably;
- Yes; Yes;
- No; Yes;
- Yes; Without a doubt;

Further comments:

- -
- No;
- -
- STDm was, and still is, a good idea, but many things mentioned above have to be changed.
- I think that STDm was definitely an experience. It was a totally different kind of course.
- I can't think of too much to say, except that maybe the course on the whole was as successful as it could have been. Planning a new course would take months and months to do, plus a great deal of energy must be spent. In the short (less than a year) existence of STDm, problems and confusing issues were kept to a minimum. This says a lot for both the coordinators and the students.
- I feel that the course should be changed. There should be modules (such that 4-5 people in a module, including coordinator). This group would stay together for the term discussing points which the group would want to discuss. This group would, after, evaluate the individuals in the course on the basis of class discussions and interest in the course.

- STDM is a most educational course - learning through experience and participation is needed.
- All in all - good course. I think it needs a little modification, but it's probably me who needs modification.
- -
- I thought this course was successful for it's first year. With some revisions, this course could be used for years to come.
- The course in itself was successful, but some changes are badly needed:
  - (1) group all modules of similar content (i.e. - form 4 modules out of the existing 8);
  - (2) extend each module to twice their previous length;
  - (3) involve students to the practical side of their decisions, instead of the theoretical;
  - (4) find out the possibility of working under a Local Initiatives Programme or with a school board (experimentally);
  - (5) to make the course more valuable, perhaps it would be wise to orientate the modules toward subject matter now being given at Loyola (i.e.: Sociology, Political Science, Business Administration); In this way it would prove more interesting, and practical for the students to apply for the course.
- No;
- If the course were offered next year, perhaps it might operate as follows: the first term would be completely structured. There would be readings, lectures, assignments on student roles, education, existing structures and other topics that are relevant to our situation. Then in the second term remove all structure and allow students to operate on their own, or in groups.
- -
- -
- -
- -

What do you think of this questionnaire?

- Very pertinent and objective; The results (feedback) should be good.
- Good - Fair;
- It's O.K.;
- I hope it helps the students next year.
- It was alright.
- Some questions are vaguely-worded, but on the whole, it's quite probing and complete.
- A little long;
- OKEY DOKEY

- Makes me see what I think;
- Pretty good;
- I found some of these questions hard to answer, believe it or not.
- Complete breakdown of the course in its main points; How can you evaluate a student's ability to coordinate a module?
- Loosly, too long;
- A fairly comprehensive one;
- Adequate - covers all areas of STDm;
- Adequate;
- I need to express my views of how this course might work better - this questionnaire did not let me say all I wanted to. See you next Tuesday.
- "

What do you think of our whole process for evaluating STDm (your impressions, what were your objectives, discussion, questionnaire)?

- Very good initiative since it was made by the students;
- Good - Fair;
- I think it was evaluated more extensively than any other course. It was done seriously.
- I thought that it was necessary for the modification of the course.
- STDm seems to have a much more definite role now than it did at the beginning of the year.
- Everything had a vital use, except for discussions, which I feel are not a true barometer of one's ability to think.
- "
- Self-evaluation is fine - all portions were vital;
- Good idea;
- None;
- "
- A fair chance to express all impressions, objectives and the like;
- Not bad;
- Good, because it seems to be aimed at student-centered learning;
- "
- "
- "
- Good;

II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW COURSE

1. A NEW NAME FOR A NEW COURSE

The name 'Student-As-Decision-Maker' was based upon that course's original purpose, as seen by Gordon Clarke, to encourage students to involve themselves on the College's decision-making committees, by offering them accreditation for the work they accomplished on those committees.

With the Senate Executive Committee's decision that serving on College committees has no connection with enrollment in the course, and the coordinators' desire to make STDm as student-oriented as possible, the students' decision-making dimension of the course was shifted from participation on College committees to the actual organization of the course's structure. In other words, instead of making decisions on Senate Committees, students would now be deciding upon the very structure of the course they were to follow.

As we saw in the earlier part of this report, in the section dealing with STDm, the students failed to come up with a successful work structure for their course. The more positive aspects of STDm were that it offered students the opportunity to explore some aspect of education and gain greater insight into their identity as students and thinkers.

In developing a new course, out of the same spirit as STDm, we felt it was important to follow the recommendations made by the students and coordinators of that course.

The new course would not be concerned as much with student decision-making at the outset, rather it would offer the unrestricted opportunity to explore the field of higher education. The name chosen for this new course was 'Explorations into Education'.

In the first few weeks of May, I was able to meet personally with Alain Godbout, who gave me a broad view of what STDM had been, some of the problems it had encountered, etc. Unfortunately, those brief meetings I had with him were the only opportunity he had to contribute towards the development of Explorations into Education.

## 2. EXPLORATIONS INTO EDUCATION: THE STEPHENSON PROPOSAL

In May 1973, just as this Summer Research project got under way, Don Stephenson - the newly appointed Media Programming Executive Assistant, came forward with a twelve-point lecture programme that would form the basis for a course which promised to be a new and dynamic approach to the development of critical and effective students.

According to Don's plan, students would attend a weekly lecture and discussion on some topic of Higher Education to be given by either a Loyola Professor or a Guest Speaker. At the end of the first semester, the students would present a written report which hopefully would indicate some change in their way of thinking about education.

The second semester would feature a series of movie presentations dealing with education followed by discussions among students and animators. The students would also be asked to complete a group study on some aspect of higher education, a study which would serve as a working paper for reform in some area of educational structure.

The following is Stephenson's twelve-point course outline, listing topics to be covered by lectures in the first semester of his proposed course:

Proposed Course Outline: Explorations Into Education (twelve weeks)

1. The Marks And Education: - the need to evaluate the student;  
- the different systems of evaluation;  
- the credit-bureau system;  
- the de-merit system for drivers;  
- the human bill of rights;
2. Degree Consciousness: - the status symbol;  
- the sociological implications;  
- salary consciousness;  
- the hierarchy of life;
3. The Peter Principle: - the level of incompetence;  
- the lack of education to overcome the level of incompetence
4. The Sociological Purpose of Education: - the implicit function of education as "inform to conform";  
- semantic distinction between training and education;
5. Education And the Transmission of Knowledge: - theories on the transmission of knowledge;
6. Education And Communications: - life as an adaptation process;  
- the poverty of media in the transmission of ideas;
7. Education Ideally: - statement on the ideal nature of education in the institutional context;  
- "Education ideally is civil defence for media fallout."  
M. McLuhan;
8. Twain And McLuhan On Education: - statement on the ideal education in the non-institutional context;  
- "Don't let schooling interfere with your education."
9. How the Student Chooses A Course: - the dissassociation of the student from his ideals in order to facilitate the movement through the system;

10. Security: - What is the meaning of security and will it be provided by the system?  
- What is the meaning of the "establishment"?
11. The System: - Parkinson's Law;
12. Does Education Belong to the Student?  
Should Education Belong to the Student?

Stephenson's course called for a gradual raising of the student's consciousness through exposure, in the form of lectures and discussions, to new ways of looking at the educational milieu he is living in. It appeared as an attractive alternative to the STDM format and would certainly have received popular support among students.

But there were several restrictions to carrying out Don's plan. First, his structure offered too little correspondance with the STDM course. It was an entirely different course and would have to be approved by the Senate's Curriculum Committee. Second, it seemed impossible to develop and coordinate a course like this in so short a time (May to September 1973), in view of the resources available on the Loyola Campus. Third, as Media Programming Executive Assistant, Don had other pressing duties such as the completion of a Communications report, and the publishing of the Student Yearbook, which did not leave him with enough time to supervise the development of the course. Without his direct participation, it was impossible to carry out the plans for this course.

### 3. EXPLORATIONS INTO EDUCATION: IN ITS DEFINITIVE FORM

The course, in its definitive form, as it is offered to

students for the winter session 1973-74, was put together with the help of Don Boisvert - Co-President of the ISA and former STD Module Coordinator, and Gerry Bushe - member of the ISA Board of Directors, and Summer Researcher for the Education Department.

### COURSE OUTLINE

Explorations into Education 050Z, is a tutorial programme which offers students the opportunity to examine and transcend the issues in Higher Education which are of interest to them. The inspiration behind this programme lies in the belief that meaningful reforms to the present educational structures are to be found in the students themselves.

Our goal is to create greater awareness of what education is, and what it should be, in order to make students more active in the formulation of their own educational experience. It should serve as a vehicle of communications for the transmission and exchange of information on education within the Loyola Community.

Explorations into Education will be more than an investigation into the theoretical aspects of higher education - it will deal with practical reforms in curriculum, teaching methods, evaluation, student life, and all other issues which concern the students, faculty and administration at Loyola.

### OBJECTIVES

In preparing Explorations into Education, the formulation of objectives for the course was a primary consideration. These objectives were created to give students some direction in carrying out their projects.

Overall Objective: The student should reflect critically and effectively on some topic or issue of higher education in terms of his or her own educational experience.

1. The student should present a journalistic report of the issue or topic to be covered.
2. The student should undertake a subjective analysis of the situation he or she is investigating, and present reforms or alternatives to the present structure.
3. The student should communicate his findings to the Loyola Community in the hope of generating some response from students and others concerned with the issue or topic.

#### FORMAT

In order to receive credit for this course, students will be required to complete one project for each thirteen-week semester, according to the schedule which follows:

#### SCHEDULE FOR EACH THIRTEEN-WEEK SEMESTER:

##### - First Two Weeks: Orientation:

During this two-week period, students will meet with the course coordinators and tutors, to discuss the issues and topics which are of interest to them. Students with common interests wishing to work together will be organized in groups.

At the end of this two-week Orientation, students will submit to the coordinators and tutors, a paper listing the following:

- (a) the issue or topic to be covered by their project;
- (b) an appropriate description of that issue or topic;
- (c) a detailed plan of the way in which they are going to carry out their project according to the objectives of the course;

- Next Nine Weeks: Individual And Group Project Work:

Students, whether working individually or in groups, will meet as often as necessary to discuss their project with their tutor or the course coordinators. They will have a classroom and seminar rooms at their disposal for these meetings.

It will be the coordinators' responsibility to make sure that students are making the necessary progress in carrying out their projects and to assist them in finding the resources for the completion of their work.

- Final Two Weeks: Evaluation:

Evaluation of the course, the students, and the coordinators will take place in the final two weeks of each semester.

The evaluation process should be in two forms:

The first should be percentage mark for the students based on the work they did; a self-evaluation by the student, ratified by the tutor, may be the best method. The second is in the form of a report to be prepared by an evaluation committee, made up of students in the course. This committee should prepare a questionnaire to measure the extent to which the course objectives were met, and whether the course is accomplishing its goal.

CONTENT

Any issue or topic relevant to the field of higher education is acceptable as content matter for projects to be carried out by students in this course. We offer the following list as a guide-line to those who don't have any particular issue or topic in mind:

"Higher Education"

A. Historical:

1. Education in a Historical Perspective
2. Theories of Education
3. CEGEPs in Quebec (Government Policy on Education)
4. The Student Movement

B. Sociological:

1. Education as a System
2. Who goes to College? Why?
3. Social Function of Education
4. Money and Education (Control)
5. Educational Alternatives

C. Psychological:

1. Techniques
2. Evaluation (Professor/Student/Course)
3. Transmission of Knowledge
4. Communication
5. Training and Educating

D. Philosophical:

1. Philosophies of Education
2. A Personal Reflection on Student Life
3. Why have teachers?
4. Should education belong to the student?

BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

According to the goals stated in the Course Outline, Explorations into Education will consist in more than just an academic research into education. A large segment of the course will be devoted to

transmitting information on education to the Loyola community.

The content of this information will be made up of the findings of students doing research in the course, as well as information coming from outside the course, such as Documentary Movies and Guest Speakers.

In order to undertake this massive job of communications with the Loyola community, two committees will be set up:

1. A Public Relations Committee;
2. An Audio-Visual Presentations Committee;

Two other committees will be set up to assure the internal functioning of the course:

3. An Academic Resource Committee, to deal with providing the resources necessary to the students' projects;
4. An Evaluation Committee, responsible for evaluating the course, the students and the coordinators;

A detailed description of each of these four committees follows, along with a budget allotment for their operation expenditures.

The committees will be made up of students from the Explorations programme. Their number will vary according to the work-load of each committee. A chairman will be chosen by the members of the committee or one will be appointed by the coordinators.

- I Public Relations Committee: It will be responsible for all outside communications.  
Budget: \$200.00 for printing costs (reports);  
\$100.00 for office supplies and promotional posters (cardboard & paint);
- II Audio-Visual Committee: It will be responsible for coordinating evening Movie and Guest Speaker presentations at the Vanier Auditorium.  
Budget: \$200.00 for Cinema Operator (20 presentations);  
\$100.00 for Movie Handling Costs;
- III Academic Resource Committee: It will be responsible for getting students the resource material and facilities they will need to carry out their research, and also for scheduling the use of seminar rooms.  
Budget: \$100.00 for reprinting materials and other incidentals;
- IV Evaluation Committee: It will be responsible for all evaluations of the course, the students and the coordinators.  
Budget: \$100.00 for the cost of printing questionnaires.

Budget For 1973-74

1. Public Relations Committee	\$300.00
2. Audio-Visual Committee	300.00
3. Academic Resource Committee	100.00
4. Evaluation Committee	<u>100.00</u>
TOTAL:	<u><u>\$800.00</u></u>

4. EXPLORATIONS INTO EDUCATION: NOW AND IN THE FUTURE

The course outline for Explorations into Education represents the programme in its ideal form. It presupposes a minimum enrollment of ten

students. Without that number, it isn't possible to carry out the programme in the form presented in the course outline.

As of September 28th., only four students were registered in E.I.E. Many reasons could be cited, and opinions postulated as to why so few students enrolled in this course, but generally speaking, the coordinator's lack of experience in dealing with educational and administrative matters at Loyola proved to be the deciding factor in the course's not fulfilling its potential. As a result of our unfamiliarity with mail-in registration procedures, no students were registered through it. The four who did register for the course did so during the registration at the hockey rink in September. The students have completed the orientation part of the programme, and are now carrying out their projects.

The \$800.00 budget we applied for was promptly granted through the Assistant Dean of Arts Office. Now that our registration is below what we had expected, we intend to use considerably less than the \$800.00 originally granted. Our intention to do so has been made clear to the office which granted the budget.

At the moment, I foresee the possibility of having additional students joining E.I.E. for the second semester. Those students will receive a half-credit for each full project they complete. A publicity campaign will be carried out in November, with emphasis on recruiting students dissatisfied with established educational programmes.

The people involved in this year's programme will take care of all administration requirements for establishing next year's programme. Therefore there will be no need for any research or coordinating work on this course in the coming summer.

The structure for Explorations into Education as a tutorial programme outlined in a pamphlet prepared for distribution to students (see Appendix B), is basically sound and would appeal to serious-minded students interested in formulating their own kind of education. Thus, I see the need for continuing this programme at the university level in the years to come. But I must add the following observations which must be kept in mind when considering such a free-form education programme.

This kind of programme may appear very attractive to those students who are looking for an easy credit. Explorations into Education, if it is to be successful in meeting its goals, will demand much more from its participants than most other traditional courses, so a careful screening of students must be made during the two weeks set aside for Orientation. The kind of student we should be looking for in E.I.E. is a person who shows some potential for being able to take care of his own affairs; a person who doesn't have to be shown every step of the way, who can undertake some responsibility and doesn't need constant supervision.

The coordinator's job for next year will involve only coordination and administration - at this point there is no immediate need for reforms in the structure of the course. I suggest that the coordinator for next year's programme receive a weekly salary of \$20.00, to be paid over a total of 30 weeks (2 weeks before the beginning of the first semester; 13 weeks of the first semester and one week after the semester; 13 weeks of the second semester, and one week at the end of the second semester: a total of 30 weeks = \$600.00).

Paying the coordinator on a weekly basis, rather than in one lump sum, is important because it will give that person a feeling of direct return for the work he is putting into the course. Also, the ISA could cut off the salary if he wasn't getting the work done. If the work

load, which in my estimation, should not exceed eight hours a week, is too big for one student to handle, another coordinator could be hired and each would then receive \$10.00 a week.

I foresee an overall budget for the E.I.E. programme of 1974-75, of about \$1,500.00, arranged in the following manner:

Coordinator's salary	\$600.00
Public Relations Committee	\$300.00
Audio-visual presentations	\$300.00
Academic Resource Committee	\$200.00
Evaluation Committee	\$100.00

In conclusion, allow me to re-state that Explorations into Education is a viable and potentially very productive vehicle of communications and reform for this campus. It is not likely to prove attractive to a large number of students; neither should it accept all those who enroll, for this course will demand a great deal of self-motivation and hard work from all its participants.

III

THE FUTURE OF STUDENT-ORIENTED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMES

Don Stephenson originally conceived his twelve-point plan for E.I.E. as an effective means of closing or at least narrowing the communications gap which exists between the ISA and its constituents - the students of Loyola.

Our concern in the future, is eliminating student apathy through academic programmes. The communications problem is intimately linked to student apathy. Students are not naturally apathetic - their apathy rises out of a lack of information on the workings of their Student Government and the College Administration. The information media on this campus have offered a level of information too sophisticated for the hitherto uninvolved student.

To counter the penury of elementary information distribution on this campus, and thus raise the degree of involvement of students in their own affairs, we need a new team of people dedicated to raising the students' consciousness about education and providing the basic information they will need to become more critical and effective students.

The tentative name for this new programme is 'University Media'. The message it will be concerned with getting across to students is as follows:

- What is education?  
Education as the development of human potential;
- What is human potential?  
How can we measure fulfillment of our potential?
- How can our human potential be better developed?

- Are students geared towards their own development?  
Is the administration geared towards developing the potential of its students,  
Is faculty geared towards development of human potential in students?
- An outline of the decision-making structures at this college:
  - Board of Trustees;
  - The Senate and its committees;
  - The Faculty Council of Arts and Science;
  - The Students' Association Executive;
  - The Students' Association Board of Directors;

At this time I can only offer a general outline of the topics this new programme should cover. If we decide to go through with the development of University Media, then it will be up to the people coordinating the programme to broaden, alter, or re-state the outline I have proposed.

The format for the programme would be similar to that which Don Stephenson had proposed for Explorations into Education. There would be a weekly three-hour session, divided in the following manner: a short lecture (30 minutes or less) followed by a question period (30 to 60 minutes), then a fifteen-minute intermission, concluding with an open discussion (75 to 105 minutes, or longer). The lecture would be given by a guest speaker or a Loyola professor. The time and the place for the lecture and subsequent discussions should be determined by the coordinators.

In addition to the weekly lecture, there should be a bi-weekly film presentation. The film would be preceeded by a short (15 minute) introduction on the significance of the film, in terms of the reflection being carried out in the programme. There should also be a discussion after the viewing of the film.

The work load will depend on the status of the University Media. There are two possible ways of administering U.M. The first is, as a full-credit university course. The second is as a non-credit Students' Association Education Department programme - a kind of permanent on-going education conference.

As a full-credit university course, University Media would be administered by a full-time university professor and two student coordinators. The work load and evaluation would then be worked out by these three people. I would foresee, as work load, a paper every three weeks and a group study for the final six weeks of the course.

Such a course, if publicized properly, should prove highly attractive to students, and I would foresee a minimum enrollment of fifty students. No screening is necessary for this course. With a minimum enrollment of fifty, this course should have a budget of no less than \$4,000.00:

Salary of full-time professor	\$1,500
Salary of student coordinators (\$500 X 2)	\$1,000
Other expenses: (Honorariums and expenses for guest lecturers, film rentals, projectionists, stationary, publicity and other misc.)	\$1,500
TOTAL:	<hr/> \$4,000

Of course there are many advantages to having this course recognized by the University, but the battle for this recognition will be long and hard; the outcome seems uncertain. Yet, there is a need for this type of programme on the Loyola Campus.

Don Stephenson has stated that without the full-credit reward, students would not involve themselves in a project of this nature. On the other hand, Gerry Gross - Chairman of the Fine Arts Department, has suggested that our programs should be of a non-credit nature. This would offer us complete freedom from any university's academic restrictions.

My own view is that it is possible to motivate students to follow a programme such as this other than by offering them credits. Furthermore, I believe it is important that such programmes have the administrative freedom to act spontaneously, in order to better meet the needs of students.

In the event it should prove impossible to have University Media recognized as a credited university course, we should seriously consider making it a non-credit programme of the Students' Association Education Department. Such a programme would face no academic restrictions. The lectures and subsequent discussions would be given in much the same way, as would the film presentations. The workload would be up to each student. It would be of a practical nature, such as getting involved in different departments of the Students' Association.

Our budget for the programme would be half of what it was for the course: \$2,000.00

Salaries for student coordinators	\$1,000
Other expenses (same as for course budget)	\$1,000
TOTLA:	<hr/> \$2,000

This \$2,000 represents nearly half of the present Education Department budget. Of course it has to be realized that this programme would constitute a very large portion of the work done by the

Education Department. There would now be a kind of permanent education conference, accessible to students, teachers, and administrators, throughout the year.

Another important point about this programme is that it must not be envisaged as a course, with registration at the beginning of the semester and remaining fixed throughout. The number of people involved in this should fluctuate, hopefully the number rising throughout the winter session.

This programme will begin at a level that most students can relate to. Everyone on this Campus is concerned with a least one common issue: education. But very few students have reflected on what education is. Yet it is essential for students who wish to fulfill their vocation as students to possess an adequate definition of education, and to formulate their educational experience according to that definition. This is the hope I hold for this programme - whether as a full-credit course or as an Education Department programme.

### SUMMARY

Explorations into Education was an attempt to consolidate all of the best elements of Student As Decision-Maker. It has not gained enough of the popular support from students to make it a truly effective vehicle of communications and reform.

In order to get the large-scale support from students, we have to uncover their needs and seek to answer them as best possible. University Media is the medium best suited to carry out those objectives.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that we continue the Explorations into Education programme at the University level, either as part of the Interdisciplinary Studies Centre, or as an Independent Studies Programme. As I pointed out earlier, the people in this year's programme will take care of establishing next year's programme.

I recommend that we seriously consider establishing the University Media programme outlined in chapter III of this report. The first step involves putting together a coordinating committee of students. If the idea gains support from students, then we can proceed to adding faculty to this committee and getting their support. This committee should prepare an outline by the month of January 1974. At that time we will be able to gauge the possibility of getting this programme accepted as a full-credit course. If we find there is no possibility of getting it recognized as a University course, then we should proceed with our plan of making it a Students' Association Education Department programme.

In either case, I think promotion of University Media should begin in the spring of 1974, with the possibility of holding introductory lectures to gain interest from students.

This programme should rely heavily on promotional techniques and should be aimed at the average student's level.



APPENDIX A

April 15, 1973.

LOYOLA  
OF MONTREAL  
STUDENTS'  
ASSOCIATION  
ASSOCIATION  
DES ETUDIANTS  
DE LOYOLA  
DE MONTREAL  
INCORPORATED  
1966  
(514) 482-9280  
6931 SHERBROOKE  
STREET WEST,  
MONTREAL 262,  
CANADA

Dear Student,

There is a full course (one full credit) being offered from September, 1973, to April, 1974, which may be of special interest to you or your friends:

EXPLORATIONS INTO EDUCATION: (26 weeks)

1. The Marks
2. The Degree
3. The Level of Incompetence
4. Education and Conformity
5. Knowledge?
6. Communication
7. The Ideal Education
8. Non-academic Education
9. The Student's Motivation
10. Security?
11. The System
12. Does education belong to the student?

Ideally, this course would be offered during the evening, with auditors being accepted on the presentation of their Loyola I.D. cards. Designed by Don Stephenson, this course is presented and co-ordinated by the Education Department of the L.S.A..

At this time we can only be assured of credit status for this course at the C.E.G.E.P. II level. However, it is possible that the course will be offered at the University level if there is sufficient response to this letter to merit such action. Please indicate your reaction to this proposed student initiative in education, using the lower section of this sheet. This should be returned immediately to:

The Education Department  
Loyola Student Association  
6931 Sherbrooke st. W.

For further information on the course, contact  
Charles Moncel at 482-2510 loc. 215.....

---

In order to comply with pre-registration procedures, the following information should be filled out, in full, and returned to us as quickly as possible.

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF BIRTH: \_\_\_\_\_

LEVEL ( 1973-74 ) \_\_\_\_\_

PERMANENT ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

TEL. NUMBER (DURING THE DAY - SUMMER) \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU ARE INTERESTED IN TAKING THE COURSE

- ☐ FOR C.E.G.E.P. CREDIT    ☐ OR AS AN AUDITOR  
☐ OR FOR UNIVERSITY CREDIT (IF POSSIBLE)

## APPENDIX B

### LOYOLA STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION: EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

#### EXPLORATIONS INTO EDUCATION 050 Z

Explorations into Education is a new course to be offered this year by the Loyola Students' Association Education Department.

The inspiration behing this course and its predecessor: Student As Decision-Maker, is the belief that meaningful reforms to the present educational structure are to be found in the students themselves. Explorations will offer the opportunity to examine and transcend the issues which are of interest to students taking the course. It will serve as a vehicle of communication and reform in the Loyola community.

Our goal is to create greater awareness of what education is and what it should be, in order to make students more active in the formulation of their own educational experience.

#### CONTENT OUTLINE

We offer students the unrestricted freedom of choosing any issue or topic relevant to higher education for their projects. The following list of topics and issues is a guideline:

##### "Higher Education"

###### HISTORICAL:

1. Education in a Historical Perspective;
2. Theories of Education;
3. CEGEPS in Quebec (Government Policy);
4. The Student Movement;

SOCIOLOGICAL:

1. Education as a System;
2. Who Goes to College?
3. Social Function of Education;
4. Money and Education (Control);
5. Educational Alternatives;

PSYCHOLOGICAL:

1. Techniques;
2. Evaluation (Professor/Student/course);
3. Transmission of Knowledge;
4. Communication;
5. Training and Educating;

PHILOSOPHICAL:

1. A Personal Reflection on Student Life;
2. Why Have Teachers?
3. Should Education Belong to the Student?

FORMAT

In order to receive credit for this course, students will be required to complete one project for each of the two 13-week semesters. The course will proceed according to the following schedule for each 13-week semester:

- First 2 weeks: ORIENTATION

During this 2-week period, students will discuss the issues

which are of interest to them. The coordinators and tutors will be on hand to help them select and elaborate their projects.

- Next 9 weeks: INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP PROJECT WORK SESSION

Students, whether working individually or in groups, will meet as often as necessary to discuss their project with their tutor or the coordinators. They will have a classroom and seminar rooms at their disposal for these meetings.

- Final 2 weeks: EVALUATION

Evaluation of the students, the course and the coordinators will be the responsibility of the Student Evaluation Committee. This committee will recommend percentage marks subject to ratification by the course tutors.

All work will be done in accordance with the objectives stated in the following section. Evaluation will be carried out according to how well those objectives were accomplished.

### OBJECTIVES

Overall Objective: the student should reflect critically and effectively on some topic or issue of higher education in terms of his or her own educational experience.

1. The student should present a journalistic report of the issue or topic to be covered.
2. The student should undertake a subjective analysis of the situation being investigated and present reforms or alternatives to the existing structures.
3. The student should communicate his findings to the Loyola community in order to generate a response from students and others concerned with the issue or topic.

Ideally, these objectives should be carried out simultaneously over the nine weeks set aside for INDIVIDUAL AND PROJECT WORK.

#### STUDENT COMMITTEES

In order to undertake the massive job of communications with the Loyola community, and to assure the proper internal functioning of the course, the following four student committees will be set up:

1. Public Relations Committee;
2. Audio-Visual Presentations Committee;
3. Academic Resource Committee;
4. Evaluation Committee;

It is hoped that a budget may be provided for the operation of these committees.